

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A SYMPOSIUM can hardly fail to be interesting, provided the subject of it is sufficiently important and the contributors to it are sufficiently competent. It will be admitted that these conditions are more than adequately met where the subject is Hell and the contributors include some of the most eminent names of the day in the fields of religion, science, and literature respectively. The exact title of the symposium to which we invite attention is *What is the Real Hell?* (Cassell; 3s. 6d. net), and the contributors are Dean INGE, Sir Oliver LODGE, Abbot BUTLER, Warwick DEEPING, Bishop WELLDON, Professor MOFFATT, Annie BESANT, Sheila KAYE-SMITH, Ernest RAYMOND, the Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, the Rev. F. W. NORWOOD, G. Hay MORGAN, K.C., and Professor Irwin EDMAN.

A sufficient diversity of outlook might well be anticipated from a group of thinkers of calibre so diverse; but, curiously enough, in what they have to say there is a surprising unanimity. It may be true, as one of the writers says, that we are left, as we must inevitably be left in our present state of knowledge, with a whole heap of unresolved difficulties and unanswered questions; but the writers, one and all, believe in Hell. Not indeed in the old traditional Hell; for Hell, like man himself, as Mr. DEEPING reminds us, has had a history. There is a Stone Age Hell, a Bronze Age Hell, the Hell of the Middle Ages, and the Hell of the Now and To-morrow. But of the reality of some Hell the writers have no doubt whatever.

VOL. XLI.—No. 9.—JUNE 1930.

Here are some of their testimonies. 'We know,' says Dean INGE, 'that there is a Hell, for we have been there, or very near it.' 'Belief in Hell,' according to Dr. MOFFATT, 'is an element of any religion which is morally healthy.' 'The man who repudiates Hell absolutely'—thus Dr. NORWOOD—'has either had a shallow experience, or is not true to the experience he has had. I believe in Hell as I believe in Man.' One of the strongest professions of faith in Hell is offered by one of the least orthodox of the contributors. Professor EDMAN reiterates his creed again and again. 'The free mind—if it recognizes the symbolic and revealing poetry of its symbols of God and Heaven—is both dishonest and inconsistent in refusing to recognize the permanent significance, the inescapable moral reality of Hell.' And again: 'What matter that the word sin is out of fashion, or that we have other more medical words for damnation. The fact and its consequences are still here.' And yet again: 'Of all the apparatus of the Christian tradition Hell has been most smiled at by the modern. Yet Hell is of all the theological notions that which empirically he knows best.'

But what is the Hell in which these writers believe, and how do they define it? There is little verbal agreement in their definitions. The representatives of the Church express themselves, as a rule, in religious language, while the others express themselves for the most part otherwise; but at bottom their meanings are not perhaps very far

apart. It will be only fair, however, to let them speak for themselves.

According to Bishop WELLDON, 'the essence of Hell, if rightly understood, seems to be remorse,' a remorse which springs from seeing sinful actions in their own light. Dr. ORCHARD suggests that Hell 'may mean simply an intense sense of what the deprivation of God means, combined with an equally intense determination to deprive oneself of Him: both together and all at once.'

Mr. DEEPING describes Hell in more secular terms. To him it is the realization of one's failure, it is 'to look back at the dim, reproachful faces of those who loved us, those whom we betrayed,' 'to stand at the end of one's days and to know that the landscape you have painted is grey, a place of stones, and of the bones of broken memories.' For Sheila KAYE-SMITH, Hell is 'nothing more or less than a complete or eternal state of self-absorption.' Similarly Ernest RAYMOND: 'Hell is that undeniable cursedness won by the wholly self-centred.' To Mr. MORGAN it 'is the condition or the state of the Spirit suffering the agony of remorse for wrong done and good left undone in this life'; while to Professor EDMAN it is 'to live deprived of all possibility of the Good'—some central good upon which the heart is set.

There is not only a substantial unanimity of thought among most of the contributors, but also at times a curious unanimity of expression and frequent use of the same material, both Biblical and extra-Biblical. Twice, for example, we are reminded that the last farthing must be paid; and twice that the Judge of all the earth will do right; twice Christ's parable of the Day of Judgment is recalled; twice His preaching to the spirits in prison is brought up; and several references occur to His solemn word, 'Fear not them that kill the body . . . but fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell,' though it is rather remarkable, considering the variety of outlook represented by the contributors, that none of them has been induced by the gracious conception of God in the immediate context (Lk 12^{6f.}) to think of

the one who has power to cast into hell as the Devil.

Even from secular literature the same quotations recur. Twice there are allusions to 'Adam Bede,' and twice to Fitzgerald's line, 'And Hell the shadow from a soul on fire.' Calvinists will be grieved to note that two of the ablest writers independently refer to Calvin's 'sadistic' theology.

Twice appeal is made to the Bible in a way which reveals how ignorant even well-informed persons may be of its real meaning. One writer remarks, 'When it is said that the wicked shall be turned into hell, it may be a statement simply true when rightly interpreted.' But if, as seems certain, this is meant to be a reference to Ps 9¹⁷, the writer would have done well to consult the Revised Version, where it is *not* said that the wicked will be turned into hell. The same mistake is made by another contributor, who, doubtless with Ps 139⁸ in view, writes of 'the truth hidden in the Psalmist's discovery that he had found God in Hell,' and adds, 'What could He be there for, He the all-loving, if not to rescue, to save?' It is always a perilous thing for the cobbler to go beyond his last.

The theologically minded contributors naturally appeal to Jesus, and it is not a little strange that in so diversified a volume, the question is only once raised whether He has been correctly reported. It is Dr. ORCHARD, in one of the ablest essays in the book, who reminds us that there are scholars who believe that the report of the teaching of Jesus on this subject has been affected by ideas cherished by the narrators, and scholars more daring still who doubt whether Jesus had worked out to their full consequences the implications of His own teaching about the Fatherhood of God.

But Dr. MOFFATT is surely right when he says that, after making every allowance, 'it seems impossible to eliminate all the severe sayings of Jesus about the future from the tradition of His teaching.' Sir Oliver LODGE agrees: 'He did not scruple to speak of a state of outer darkness where there is

weeping and gnashing of teeth.' And Bishop Welldon: 'Our Lord's language respecting the future invisible world must be figuratively understood; but nobody who reads it can mistake the awful solemnity of the relation between the present and the future lives.'

There is great diversity of opinion among the contributors on the destiny of man after death. Some argue that man is not inherently immortal, but 'immortable'—to use an abominable word, *i.e.* immortality is for him a possibility. Others believe that the soul enters upon a state of probation after death; others that in the end all will be saved, for God must in the end be 'all in all'; others that we know and can know nothing whatever about the future state. While Sir Oliver LODGE assures us that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Divine goodness for ever,' Dean INGE, who has never believed in the inevitability of progress, will say no more than that 'if there is any future probation, it is absolutely unknown to us, and we have no right to assume any such thing.'

The old-fashioned Hell has certainly gone for ever. It has been driven out by science and by conscience, especially the Christian conscience. As Professor EDMAN says, 'it is incredible to our knowledge of astronomy, and revolting to our sense of justice.' Whatever the future may have in store, those who believe in God through Christ will look forward to it in the confident assurance that all that is done to us there will be done in justice and in love; the God revealed in Jesus Christ can be trusted to be neither unloving nor unjust.

But three things must be steadily borne in mind. One is that, on any view of the future, life in this world is of quite incalculable importance. The second is that the belief in God as Father is very far from being identical with the belief that 'He's a Good Fellow, and 'twill all be well.' A God who truly loved us would be quite certain to be much more than a merely good-natured, amiable God. The third is that, if free will is now and continues

to be a reality, there can be no demonstrable and irrefragable certainty of final salvation for all; for so long as the conditions of the future state are unknown to us, how could there be any certainty that the soul that rejected the best that it knew in this world would embrace it with rapture in the world to come?

We may fittingly conclude this sketch of an interesting book in the words of Mr. Hay MORGAN, 'I am aware that all this is surmising. We can but guess—we cannot dogmatize. Yes, we can also hope.'

Among the thoughtful and scholarly readers of the Anglican Communion, Dr. A. E. J. RAWLINSON holds a distinctive place. He is, we imagine, an Anglo-Catholic of the broader type, neither an extremist nor an obscurantist, and in his recent book, *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (reviewed in another column), he shows himself in an attractive light. We are, however, specially concerned here with one section of that book which may possibly turn out to be of special importance. It is an appendix with the heading 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence and the Possibility of an Eirenicon.' The suggestion in this brief essay is one that is worthy of careful consideration.

Dr. RAWLINSON begins with the distinctions which are traditional in regard to the Sacrament. These are the 'sign' or symbol, the bread and wine, the 'reality' (*res*), which is the Body and Blood of the Lord, and finally the 'virtue' or efficacy, which points to the benefits conveyed. And these point also to the distinct views held of the Sacrament. The purely symbolist view (associated with Zwingli) affirms that the Sacrament is merely a sign; the 'receptionist' view asserts that it is not merely a sign but an efficacious sign, a means of Divine grace which in effect conveys to those who rightly receive it the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood; while those who affirm the doctrine of the Real Presence acknowledge the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*, or 'thing signified.'

It has been said that 'the danger of the word "Presence" is its connotation of absence at other times.' But those who affirm a belief in the Real Presence would deny that their doctrine involves such a connotation. They discriminate different senses and meanings of the term 'presence.' They would agree that Christians are at all times and in all places in the presence of Christ. Yet they would affirm that there is in a real sense a special presence of Christ which is objectively mediated through the sacramental elements of bread and wine, which, in virtue of their consecration, are no longer *mere* bread and wine, but have become for faith's discernment in a real though mysterious sense Christ's Body and Blood.

Now the difficulties of this doctrine are obvious. What is at stake in the controversy is the affirmation of the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*—Christ's Body and Blood. Is there any way of presenting this truth which may provide an eirenicon between 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals'? The present Master of Corpus Christi College, Mr. Spens, has suggested such a way, and Dr. RAWLINSON is impressed with the possibilities of reconciliation that lie in his view. The essence of his view seems to lie in the belief that in the Lord's Supper there is not only a symbolism of action (as in Baptism), but also 'an effectual symbolism of objects.'

By an 'effectual symbol' is meant a symbol which does not merely convey a message but effects a result. A case in point would be token coinage, or paper money. A florin has not only the value of its intrinsic worth as silver, but a further value which is given to it by the State, and is capable of effecting results. So a pound note in itself is valueless, but, as a symbol of further value given to it by the will of the State, it is an 'effectual symbol' of a pound note. The essence of such symbolism is the association of certain results with certain visible signs by a will which is competent to bring about those results. Now in the case of the Eucharist the authority which invests the elements of bread and wine with a significance, character, and potency which did not belong to

them before is the will of God, which is competent to bring about the results which are in view in the Holy Supper.

In other words, the bread and wine, from the moment of their consecration as media of the appointed Sacrament, become, for Christian faith, instinct, by a determination of the sovereign will of God, with a wholly new meaning and potency, a new character, a new set of capacities and properties. They become from henceforward the effectual symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, capable of mediating all that is meant and involved in eucharistic communion with Christ. They have acquired a new property, namely, that their devout reception secures and normally conditions participation in the blessings of Christ's sacrifice, and therefore in His life. In *this* sense, they have become, without any connotation of materialism (and also without any implication of cannibalism), Christ's Body and Blood. They have become Christ's Body and Blood '*simply in and through their becoming effectual symbols.*' (The italics are Dr. RAWLINSON'S.)

This is important, and may be expanded. An effectual symbol is rightly described (as we saw in the case of a pound note), not in terms of its original and natural properties, but in terms rather of its new and acquired significance and efficacy, *i.e.* in terms of the reality which it effectually symbolizes. If this holds good even in the case of a piece of paper, which by a determination of the will of the State has the significance and efficacy of a pound sterling, *a fortiori* it holds good in the case of the eucharistic gifts, which by a determination of the will of God have the significance and efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ. For the new spiritual significance and efficacy of the elements in their sacramental capacity are no less real than their original character and significance as merely natural objects. This would justify us speaking of the elements as Christ's Body and Blood simply as asserting that they render Him appropriable as our sacrifice.

The natural properties of the bread and wine,

considered simply as bread and wine, remain wholly unchanged. But now, from the point of view of faith, these are irrelevant. What is significant about the elements *now* is that they have become the potential media of communion, that they are ('in the sense indicated, though not, of course, in any other sense') the Body and Blood of Christ. It is precisely because the devout reception of the elements unites us to Christ—it is upon the ground of the new significance, capacity, and efficacy which from henceforth attach, by Christ's appointment, to the consecrated elements in virtue of their consecration—that they can be rightly called the Body and Blood of Christ. They are a *focus*, in time and space, for the objective worship of Christ as our sacrifice.

We have set forth this remarkable statement at length, because it is an effort to build a bridge between reasonable Evangelicals and reasonable Anglo-Catholics. And it does seem to hold out a prospect of a common understanding. The reasonable Evangelical will probably reflect, 'if the elements are only effectual symbols (in the full sense of these words as explained) as a paper note is an effectual symbol, then there is no change in the actual element. As the pound note remains paper, and is only invested with greater properties by the will of the State, so the elements remain bread and wine, and are invested with higher value by the will of God. There does not seem to be any ground for serious difference in such a view, and I need not find any ground of serious criticism in the devotional language in which devout souls may clothe this faith.' Probably extremists in both camps will remain unreconciled, but Dr. RAWLINSON is appealing beyond them to the large company of earnest and open-minded Christians in both camps. And he may find sympathy and understanding among them.

now Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Dr. MACHEN is an inheritor of the Princeton theological tradition, standing in the succession of Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield. Indeed, much of the matter contained in this volume has already appeared, sometimes in more elaborate form, in the *Princeton Theological Review*. Whatever we may think of Dr. MACHEN's doctrinal standpoint, we cannot but be impressed by his learning and ability, and recognize that in this respect also his name may fitly be placed alongside those of Hodge and Warfield.

Two explanations are possible of the Church's belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus of Nazareth. One is that Jesus was actually conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. That explanation Dr. MACHEN considers in chapters i.-xi., in which he examines the positive testimony to the Virgin Birth and the objections that have been raised against it. The other explanation is that through some sort of error the Church came to accept the Virgin Birth as a fact. That explanation is considered in chapters xii.-xiv., in which the alternative theories that would elucidate the origin of the idea of the Virgin Birth are examined. The exposition tends at times to become prolix and commonplace, and even to repeat itself; on the other hand, this is counterbalanced by a wholly admirable lucidity.

An analysis of the work will show its scope and standpoint more clearly. But let us preface our analysis with the remark that Dr. MACHEN does little to meet the main difficulty attaching to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. It is not enough to show (if it is shown) that the Virgin Birth tradition is securely imbedded in the Gospels and that, if it is not true, its origin has not been explained. The difficulty concerning the doctrine is scientific or biological rather than critical and historical; and all that Dr. MACHEN can say in this reference is that the fact of the Virgin Birth is a miracle—a miracle in no lower sense than that it represents 'an intrusion into the order of nature of the creative power of God.'

The Virgin Birth of Christ (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 15s. net), by Professor J. Gresham MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., is a notable contribution to conservative Christian apologetics. Though he is

First comes a learned investigation of the second-century testimony to the Virgin Birth; as a result of which it would appear that a firm and well-formulated belief in this doctrine extends back to the early years of the second century, and that the denials of it in the second century were probably based upon philosophical or dogmatic prepossession, whether on the part of individuals like Carpocrates and Cerinthus, or on the part of groups like the obscure sect of the Ebionites. Following up this investigation, Dr. MACHEN considers the birth and infancy narrative in the Third Gospel, and reaches the conclusion that if literary criticism has established anything at all, it has established the fact that this is an integral part of the Third Gospel.

The genuinely Palestinian character of Lk 1⁵⁻²⁵² in general is then vindicated; after which special consideration is given to the Magnificat and the Benedictus, which are represented as not—as in Harnack's view—artificial compositions of a Gentile Christian, but as confirmative of the author's opinion as to the Semitic and Palestinian origin of the whole narrative. It is uncertain whether the narrative was composed by Luke himself on the basis of Aramaic oral tradition or of a Semitic document, or whether the source, if it came into Luke's hands in a Greek form, was composed originally in Greek, or in Hebrew, or in Aramaic. But in the midst of so much uncertainty the fact of its genuinely primitive and Palestinian character, it is held, stands out clear.

Here Dr. MACHEN has to face the theory of interpolation. Many modern scholars grant the Palestinian origin of Lk 1⁵⁻²⁵², but declare that attestation of the Virgin Birth formed no original part of the narrative. This theory is carefully examined in its various forms; and in particular Völter's theory is refuted, that those parts of Lk 1 which concern Jesus (including the mention of the Virgin Birth) are secondary elements in a process of literary manipulation. The Virgin Birth, it is contended, is no secondary element in the Lucan narrative.

Turning to the narrative in Matthew, Dr. MACHEN holds that, even granted to Merx that the original reading in 1¹⁶ is 'Joseph begat Jesus,' no conclusion derogatory to the attestation of the Virgin Birth would necessarily follow. As Burkitt points out, the word 'begat' in the genealogy simply means 'had as a legal heir.' The physical paternity of Joseph is not asserted.

The relation between the infancy narratives in Matthew and in Luke is now considered, and the conclusion stated that they are on the one hand completely independent, and on the other hand not at all contradictory. This strengthens the external evidence for the Virgin Birth, and leads to the further consideration: Are the narratives inherently credible? This, as we remarked at the outset, is the crucial question. The answer will be given in the negative by those who are opposed in principle to an acceptance of the supernatural, or else do not believe that the supernatural is manifested in the life of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. But where the supernatural origin of Christianity is allowed, there should be no special objection, says Dr. MACHEN, on psychological or historical grounds to the infancy narratives.

Moreover, these narratives are congruous with the rest of the New Testament. 'If the question were simply whether a man about whom otherwise we knew nothing was born without human father, no doubt that question would have to be answered in the negative. But as a matter of fact that is not the question at all. The question is not whether an ordinary man was born without human father but whether Jesus was so born. . . . So unique a person, it might well be argued, may well have had a unique entrance into the world.'

So far chapters i.-xi., which occupy two-thirds of the book. A more modern conservative writer would probably have traversed the aforesaid ground more rapidly, and given more space, relatively speaking, to the discussions of the alternative theories which, on the assumption that Jesus of Nazareth was not really born of a virgin, seek to explain the origin of the belief in the Virgin Birth.

While saying this, we cannot but be grateful to Dr. MACHEN for his very full and fair-minded discussion of the theories of Jewish derivation and pagan derivation respectively—a discussion, we should add, which reckons with the findings of the most recent scholarship, as exemplified in works by Gressmann, Leisegang, and Norden.

As for the theory of Jewish derivation, the overwhelming majority of modern scholars are agreed that the story of the Virgin Birth is, in Merx's words, 'as un-Jewish as possible.' It never arose in the Jewish Christian Church on the basis of purely Jewish ideas. There has been a practically universal rejection of the view that the principal germ of the story is to be found in Is 7¹⁴ ('Behold the virgin shall conceive,' etc.). And as for the theory of pagan derivation, its advocates are divided among themselves. Some regard it as a reflex among Gentile Christians of the pagan notions

about children begotten by the gods; others as an ancient pagan idea already naturalized in the pre-Christian Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. But neither of these theories has obtained anything like general assent.

In his concluding chapter Dr. MACHEN emphasizes the importance to his mind of belief in the Virgin Birth to the Christian man. It is important for the general question of the authority of the Bible. It is important as a test of our view of Jesus Christ, as to whether it is naturalistic or supernaturalistic. And it has an importance all its own. Without the story of the Virgin Birth there would be something seriously lacking in the Christian views of Christ. It is just here, however, that the modern dogmatician would be likely to join issue. In most modern theologies of the conservative type the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is not regarded as integral to the dogmatic system.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

V.

Marriage.

BY THE REVEREND A. HERBERT GRAY, D.D., LONDON.

It might well be thought that everything has been said about Marriage that can be said, and that there is no need for further writing about it. But if the real truth about it has often been declared, it has certainly not been generally believed and acted on. There is no subject on which to-day there is more confusion of thought, and there is still a vast amount of suffering in our midst due to the mismanagement of the married relationship. Wherefore it would seem to be worth while to attempt to state the truth about it as clearly as possible.

The mind of Christ about marriage must be understood rather by realizing the implications of the few things He said, than by insisting on the letter. His one great saying really goes to the root of the matter. 'He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said . . . they twain shall be one flesh.' That is an emphatic assertion that the intimacies of married life are part

of the Divine intention. If that be so, they must be essentially beautiful and capable of forwarding the highest life of men and women. To think of them as almost shameful, or as mere manifestations of some animal element in our humanity, is to go wrong in thought from the first. Unless this central thing in life which we call marriage can, with all its various implications, be caught up into man's highest life and made to minister to the spirit, no complete redemption is possible for us. Assuredly if we are to be 'saved,' marriage must be 'saved.'

The one vital truth at the heart of this subject is also the central fact about sex. That truth is that the sex element, which is so central and masterful, alike in men and in women, makes possible a union of a man and a woman on all levels of their personalities so complete, harmonious, and joyous that it may well be considered the crown of

this incarnate life. There is an instinctive sense in all of us which tells us that only through union with another can the self find its fullest life. We are insufficient to ourselves, and prolonged loneliness is of all tortures the most subtle and the most devastating. I think it is true that the only union which can ultimately perfectly and permanently satisfy any spirit is union with God Himself. In nothing less than that can we find our consummation. But in this incarnate life the fact of sex makes possible a union between two human beings which is the most beautiful and joyous thing which merely human experience can contain. When one man and one woman truly find each other they find something that completes life. They not only find joy in each other, but each is conscious that his or her personality has attained to harmony. The mystery and delight of the experience depend in large measure on the fact that the two are so profoundly different from each other, and so are able to supplement each other. Each brings a distinctive contribution to their common life. No doubt each will remain in some measure an unsolved problem to the other, but it will prove an intriguing and even a fascinating problem. Each will meet for the other some of the profoundest needs of our natures: the need for some one to share all æsthetic pleasures; the need for some one to share in the joy of success and uphold in hours of failure; the need of a confidante who can be absolutely trusted; the need of an answering mind; the need of a stay in hours of self-distrust and despair; the need of sympathy and understanding; the need of an object on which to lavish emotion; the need of one who will give love in a measure which can never be deserved.

It belongs to the essence of such a relationship that while each retains a measure of reverence for the other, there shall be no reserves. The intimacy of communion must be complete. And into such a relationship physical intimacy will enter naturally and spontaneously, as an inevitable happy and beautiful part of the general union of the two. It will occur as the harmonious culmination of mutual affectionate approach. In it the body will operate as the organ of the spirit, and mere bodily desire will be transmuted into an emotion of love in which the loved one fills the whole of consciousness. And this is found to involve a solution of the body's problem. Passion which has its roots so deep in the flesh achieves in this way an expression which is in harmony with the whole life of man or woman. Thus personality is unified, and the distractions, frictions, and strains of our disordered selves are

resolved. Of such union children are the normal and ordained result; and with their advent, what had been a mere union of two persons broadens out into a many-sided companionship in the management of a home and a family. Nor until this happens is the married relationship purged of a certain selfishness which characterizes it at first. No wise person grudges to young lovers their absorption in each other, and their indifference to the rest of the world. But when that condition is deliberately prolonged it tends to cramp the growth of personality, and even to give marriage an anti-social aspect. The school of parentage, however, is the greatest of all schools for enforcing a certain moral discipline and for lifting men and women above their merely selfish concerns.

Only when this truth is perceived are we in a position to say that the sex element in our humanity leads normally to great and beautiful results. When it is perceived we have so far read the Divine intention. This is what passion and love were designed to lead to. This is why sex is so central and masterful a force in our humanity.

That such unions as I have tried to picture are comparatively rare does not affect the real issue. The possibility of them constitutes the goal in attaining to which humanity must at last find itself. If few can love to that degree of perfection, all may at least aim at such love. If most unions are interrupted by offences which call for much forgiveness, that only means that we are a host on the march and have not yet arrived.

The possibility of such unions was for the greater part of the past so dimly realized that marriage has, in fact, been something very different from what I have suggested. Often it amounted to little more than the ownership of a woman by a man. Later, when the idea of such ownership had been repudiated, it was still true that many men regarded their wives as little more than accessories to whom they might turn for relaxation in hours of leisure. The idea of a full and free companionship between equals as the very essence of marriage is only now beginning to attain recognition. It is not yet fully embodied in the law of any country, so far as I know. But no other conception of marriage is worth talking about. This alone is Christian. This alone satisfies the instinctive moral demands alike of men and women. We can only truly progress as we more fully embody this conception in life.

Let us note certain necessary implications of this view. *Firstly*, such unions are inevitably exclusive of other similar intimacies. Mr. Bertrand Russell, while endeavouring to claim much for

marriage, and while capable of writing noble passages about it, still wants to claim for married persons liberty to indulge in subsidiary sex relations. But he never faces the fact that no man can give his whole self to two women. Nor can any woman give her whole self to two men. What a truly married man would be able to offer to another woman would be essentially of the nature of a passionate interlude, not a complete mutual sex relationship. And in such an offer there is involved a profound insult. A truly self-respecting woman would be bound to refuse it. Still further, the offer could only be made by a man who for the time being was not getting what he wanted out of his marriage. And that in turn would mean that instead of giving his mind to the development of a common life with his wife on such lines as were offering themselves, he was seeking for himself satisfaction apart from his wife, and so being disloyal to the demands of their common adventure.

I hold it to be an entirely unchristian view that such offences should never be forgiven either by husband or wife, or that they inevitably end the life of communion between the two. Love that is really love can forgive without limit. But such episodes ARE offences—offences against the mutual loyalty involved in the very conception of marriage. Real love gives everything—everything in the present, and everything for the future.

Secondly, and for the same reason, true marriage is lifelong marriage. What a man offers to a woman when he truly loves her is to be her companion through all the varied experiences of life unto the end. He proposes to enjoy with her her youth, to be her companion in the serious activities of middle life, and to learn with her how to fill life's evening with mutual sympathy and with what is well called in the marriage service 'cherishing.'

It may prove that what he has undertaken is at times no easy task. But real love does not ask only for easy tasks. The best of married life is not for beginners. The communion of love only enters on its highest phases when man and wife have come through much together—have survived through difficulties—have had to learn the worst of each other, and have been afresh bound to each other by forgiveness given and received. After such experiences there is a security and a peace in their love which the young can never know. And the vital relevance of this truth lies in the fact that when married persons propose from the first that they shall be free to part when difficulties appear, they renounce beforehand the best and most beautiful experiences which marriage can mean.

Real marriage, then, has five inevitable characteristics. 1. It is rooted in love. 2. It involves the body as well as the mind, and it ennobles bodily experience. 3. It issues in children—welcomed as the fruit of love. 4. It is exclusive of other intimate sex relationships; and 5. It is a lifelong partnership.

A separate article would be needed to discuss adequately the subject of the terms on which society ought to be willing to release two persons from the marriage bond.

Our present procedure is certainly open to severe criticism. Divorce to-day is possible for those who will stoop to subterfuge or open infidelity, and is denied to those who refuse such degradation.

It is granted for certain specific reasons which do not include some of the most subtle and intense forms of cruelty. And as a result acute suffering is common.

Personally, I believe that the number of grounds on which divorce may be granted ought to be increased, but, while I recognize the vital importance of that subject, I am more concerned in this article to deal with certain other matters. For, apart from changes in the law, much might be done to increase the number of happy marriages, in connexion with which no question of divorce would arise.

The real line of progress must consist, *firstly*, in such moral education of the young as will really fit them for an adult life, which can never be successful except for those who have known discipline, whether they be married or single. And *secondly*, in making certain that before they marry men and women are made fully acquainted with the truth about the married state.

There are in the world to-day a certain number of men and women for whom it is impossible to anticipate success in the married relationship. Never having learnt to say no to themselves, they are not in possession of themselves. Being constantly the victims of caprice, or of any passing emotion, they are incapable of following any line of conduct involving continuous self-control. They demand of life that at every turn it shall please them, and when it fails to do so they become petulant and foolish. Profoundly self-centred, they are incapable of any love that involves self-giving. Unfortunately, many of them are possessed of great sex attraction, but when they enter on marriage their marriages are foredoomed. And there is no way of preventing such instances of married misery except the way of securing for all our children a training throughout childhood which shall issue in the power of sustained self-management.

Fortunately, the number of such persons is small, and for the rest there is much that might be done to prepare them for success in marriage. About four points in particular I wish to speak.

First we might offer to the young a consistent and sincere testimony to the effect that the only reason for marriage which gives hope that it may be a success is honest love, and that those who marry without love are degrading both themselves and the estate of matrimony. They degrade themselves because the physical intimacies which follow marriage, while beautiful as the expression of love, are on any other basis unlovely and unpleasant. Women who endure them without love often acquire a deep distaste for them. Men who ask for them except in the name of love are merely using their wives' bodies for their own satisfaction. The ugly phrase 'legalized prostitution' is, unfortunately, all too applicable to such cases. Further, it is beyond question that nothing but love can solve the uncounted little problems which occur daily when two persons live in the intense intimacy which marriage involves. The possibilities of friction and annoyance which the situation presents are so numerous that the really wonderful thing about contemporary society is the large number of couples who surmount them successfully. But they only do it in the power of sincere affection.

Yet marriages without love are very common to-day. The instinct towards marriage is so very strong in women in the later twenties, that thousands of them decide 'to chance it,' though they know that their hearts have not really been touched. Further, family and other influences are often brought to bear upon them to induce them to do so. One of the most unhappy marriage tragedies known to the writer is that of a woman who was urged by her family to a 'suitable marriage,' though her heart was quite untouched. Her clergyman was even enlisted in the matter to tell her that 'a woman's part in life is to sacrifice herself.' And so she yielded, only to meet after a few years the man who was her real counterpart, and who stirred her to the depths. She now finds herself tied to a man to whom she cannot give what he wants, compelled to part from the man for whom her deepest self yearns, and to face for herself a future in which she sees no chance of happiness. While families and even ministers of religion play such parts, the cause of successful marriage is constantly being betrayed.

A second truth that ought to be forcibly urged on the attention of all young people is that mere physical fascination is NOT a sufficient ground for

marriage, and affords no real hope of lasting happiness. Strong mutual physical attraction may lead to physical experiences of a very intense and moving kind. But only for a time. Inevitably and ere very long each must face the truth as to what sort of a person the other is. And very often at that point the two discover that they have very little in common. Their tastes may be divergent, and their convictions in violent conflict. Of real mental and moral affinity they may have none, and then each will find it increasingly distasteful to have to remain in the company of the other. I have known a woman who once was simply enraptured, wake up to realize that the man she had married was really, according to her sincere taste, a horrible man. I have known husbands who once were utterly fascinated reach a point at which they unwillingly, but none the less completely, despised the women they had married. In such marriages no happy sense of community in thought and feeling will every now and then lead to a heightened sense of affection. Physical union will not happen as the culmination of a joyful fellowship involving their whole personalities. And so finally physical intimacy will itself become distasteful. Passion may flame up now and then and, carrying them both away, delude them into believing that they are truly united. But inexorably the truth will assert itself. And after that married life will be reduced to a matter of endurance. Nobody who has dealt at first hand with the realities about marriage in the modern world can fail to wish that this truth—perhaps more than any other in the whole field—might be forcibly presented to each rising generation.

A third service that might be rendered by those who desire to increase the number of successful marriages is to make it certain that correct and sufficient knowledge of the technique of married life on its physical side be offered to those who are about to marry. The fact is that in these days large numbers of couples who do sincerely love each other are failing to attain sexual harmony, and are therefore in trouble. That mutual and joyful experience which might unite them and smooth their way is being missed; and in consequence a situation arises in which acute nervous strain is unavoidable. It would seem to have been assumed in Britain that husbands will know by instinct the art of making love, and of leading a woman through that series of emotions which will ultimately enable her to play her part happily in the sacrament of bodily intimacy. But no such assumption is justified. I have known a good many men who, on the threshold of marriage, have assured me that

they knew all that they needed to know; but I doubt if I have known one who really did know. The means for acquiring such knowledge have not been available until very lately. The Church has as yet done nothing in the matter, and the books which do offer the necessary knowledge are far from being wholly acceptable from a Christian point of view. So honeymoons continue to be often unhappy experiences, and couples who do truly love each other find only strain, discomfort, and discord in the intimacies of their new life—a bitter and disillusioning experience. Our conspiracy of silence about a permanent and God-ordained feature of our human life has indeed had bitter fruits, and the most bitter of them are often gathered by affectionate and high-minded people who, through ignorance and awkwardness, have failed to achieve mutual adjustment within marriage. The outspoken things which have been written about 'The sin of the Bridegroom' are no doubt often true. But bridegrooms sin chiefly through sheer ignorance of how to play their part, and of how to adjust themselves with delicacy and consideration to a nature very different from their own. How can they help such ignorance in a society where very often there is no one to enlighten them! The Church performs the marriage ceremony and sends couples away with its blessing, but has only in the smallest degree done anything to secure for them a knowledge of the delicate art which they must learn to practise if their marriage is to be a success. It is foolish and prudish to pretend that there is not a physical problem in every marriage, or that its solution is not a matter of vital moment. We incarnate beings cannot live happily or truly in disregard of physical facts, and the effort to do so is not high-minded or spiritual; it is simply foolish. All the people who have had any extensive and firsthand experience of this side of life are agreed that if only true education in the technique of married life were made available to both men and women, a large percentage (probably over 50 per cent.) of divorce cases might be avoided.

And, lastly, it might be explained to all who marry that a successful marriage, like any other great moral and spiritual achievement, is something that must be worked for and that does not create itself. Modern novel-writers never seem to weary of telling stories of married couples who, after a time, discover that there are difficulties inherent in the married relationship, and who, for that reason, break out into denunciations of the institution of marriage. Probably in this respect the novelists quite truly represent modern men and

women. Having started with the delusion that within marriage all things OUGHT to go smoothly, and that human life OUGHT to be a happy thing for married people, great numbers of people become angry and bitter when they discover that their assumptions were quite unwarranted. The art of living a successful human life is always a great and difficult one; and though it may be easier for two people who attack the problem together, even for them it cannot be made simple. Married persons have got to create their own happiness by patience, unselfishness, good temper, and, if possible, some humour, or else they will never possess it. It is quite beyond the reach of the impatient, the merely impulsive, or the self-centred. And nothing can alter that inexorable decree.

In particular it would save a vast amount of pain and disappointment if we would all realize that in all departments of our life we are subject to the action of a certain rhythm, or to alternating phases of high and low vitality. This is true of our general reaction to life. We have moods in which we feel we could do anything, and alas, we have others when the plainest tasks seem to intimidate us, and we drag through the hours of the day. It is notoriously true of artists that after periods during which inspiration has been clear and commanding they experience others in which they feel they will never again be able to create. All the literature of spiritual experience bears testimony to the same general truth in connexion with religion. After periods during which the glory of religious truth has been experienced, and in which the wonder of it has lifted the soul to the heights, there come phases of 'dryness,' in which men are tempted to believe they have lost all spiritual capacity—so dead and flat do they find themselves. And the same thing is true in relation to the romantic history of the normal man, and still more so in relation to the normal woman. After the first great hour in which young lovers find each other and confess their love, it is notorious that there often follows another phase during which both are harassed by doubts, and find it very difficult to adjust themselves to their new experience. So also after the first wonderful phase of exhilaration which often delights young married couples, there must follow another phase of lowered romantic activity. The man must allow his life occupation to engross much of his time and thought. The woman must find ways of giving scope to her independent personality. Further, the very element of physical feeling which played so large a part in their first happy days of union will assuredly retire

into the background. Our creative instincts and desires are subject to fluctuation, and the light of pure romance NEVER burns steadily throughout life. It is in such periods that husbands and wives have to learn to fall back on community of interest, and must develop that solid friendship which has to be the backbone of any lasting marriage. Good lovers have to learn to be good friends. Those who have had intense joy in each other have to learn also to give much to each other, and at times to serve rather than merely enjoy. What was at first a fellowship of a very sacred, private, and exclusive kind must broaden till it becomes a fellowship in facing the whole of life. Otherwise marriage would be a poor and narrowing affair.

And then for those who have been learning loyalty and sympathy in a cooler atmosphere romance will return. The delusion that it belongs only to the first few years of marriage is perhaps the most mischievous one now abroad in the world. It is no such fleeting and capricious power. It returns; and it returns with new power. There is, in fact, an intimacy of communion and a deep joy in the union which marriage means which is possible only to those who are far on in their journey.

To-day a very great many couples miss that consummation in marriage; and they miss it because having entered on marriage either in ignorance or with false anticipations, they allow themselves to be defeated by the problems and strains which are really inherent in the married state.

It may well be said that no amount of mere talking or writing can give people the moral purpose and the constancy of will which alone will carry them through. But though that is true, it is also true that people who know beforehand what they must expect, and who therefore have a chance to prepare themselves for the future, have at least a greatly heightened chance of attaining to success.

The knowledge on which success in marriage may

be based is in the possession of the human race. But we have done sadly little in making it available in time for each generation as it presses on into life.

The Divine intention for men and women is NOT beyond realization by quite ordinary people, but it is essential that life in this respect should be based on knowledge and not on sentimental delusions.

There is a final word which Christ would assuredly have to say to all who enter on marriage. He would say to them that without Divine help in this, as in every other department of life, we 'can do nothing.' He would insist that life on a godless foundation is always life tending towards ruin. He would say that to look to God for His blessing and His guidance is the first essential of all real success in life's greater ventures. Experience constantly endorses this word. The people who fail in marriage are very often just people who are failing in life; and they are failing in life because their spiritual natures are starved. Having found nothing great enough in life to satisfy their Divine natures—having, that is to say, turned from the only communion which could possibly fill them with deep content—they are profoundly unhappy. They may turn to their wives or their husbands, hoping to have their malady cured. But that malady no one can cure for another. Two godless, and therefore unhappy people in one house cannot save each other. Rather because each is inwardly starved and restless they are likely to 'get on each other's nerves' and to blame each other for a weariness which is, in truth, only the result of neglecting God.

The deepest, truest thing which can be said about the secret of success in marriage, is the same thing that has to be said about the secret of success in life. And that secret is that only those who by contact with God have been delivered from self, and released from the small and stuffy house of self-centred living, are able to find life in any great and truly happy sense.

The Purpose of Deuteronomy, Chapter V.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

MODERN commentators, such as Hempel and Steuernagel, differ greatly in their treatment of this chapter. But they all agree in denying its unity and in questioning whether the Decalogue formed an original part of it. Their decision as to

the verses which they refer to the original, and those which they count secondary, is largely determined by their respective theories on the function these early chapters were intended to fulfil in connexion with the Code of chs. 12-26 to which they have been

prefaced. I suggest that there is need to try a new method of approach to the whole question. And that is to take a section like ch. 5 by itself, and seek to discover whether it shows any purpose in its author. Studied in isolation, it may show itself to be a unity, and to reveal a definite aim.

Only after such careful examination of each section will it be possible to arrive at any clear idea of their relation to each other and to the Code, before which they have been placed.

My contention is that 5²⁻³³ (possibly also 6¹) is a unity, written to convey a clear judgment on a large issue in Hebrew religion.¹ The writer cast his teaching into the form of a record of certain events which took place at Horeb at the time of the giving of the Law. When he says in v.³ that Yahweh made a covenant there, not with the fathers, but with us, even all of us, here, alive this day, he is emphasizing that he wishes to refer to an earlier time than that in which the Deuteronomic law was delivered, and to a different place from the east of Jordan. He is not merely differing from 24¹⁴, but he is deliberately differing. He wishes it to be recognized that what he has to say deals with the time when Israel received the first revelation of its law. The way in which he differs points to the chapter having been written after the Code was collected, and even after it had been provided with some introduction.

He declares then that at Horeb Yahweh, speaking from the midst of the fire, revealed the Decalogue directly to the people. The terms of the Decalogue are the *d'bhārīm* or 'words,' not 'statutes' and 'judgments': they are final in their content—Yahweh added no more; they are also immutable—Yahweh wrote them on two tables of stone (v.²²). They are also intended for Israel in all conditions and at all periods. If the people observe them faithfully, it will be well with them and with their children for ever (v.²⁹). In connexion with these

¹ The one exception is v.⁵. As it stands, this forms a long parenthesis, and the Hebrew never liked parentheses. Some one, rather pedantically, took offence at the statement in v.⁴ that Yahweh spoke 'face to face' to the nation, a privilege which he found elsewhere reserved to Moses. He therefore thrust in a verse which anticipates what follows in v.²⁷. It agrees with that verse in making Moses the intermediary between Yahweh and the people; but, by introducing the statement here, misses the point which the original writer desired to make, viz., that Moses only became such an intermediary because the people were unable to bear the direct revelation from Yahweh.

laws, there is no reference to the land which the people are about to enter.

If Yahweh confined Himself to the Decalogue in His revelation of His will to the people, it was because they were unable to bear more. They begged for one who should stand between them and their God, because they could not bear the strain which such a revelation implied. And it is significant that, so far from any blame being attached to them for their attitude, they are commended for the request, and are bidden see in Moses the divinely appointed intermediary between them and their God. The passage has an obvious connexion with 18²⁸, where the nation is forbidden to have anything to do with soothsayers of all kinds, because Yahweh has sent and will send continually men belonging to its own faith who will meet this need. The revelation which began at Horeb will never cease. For the prophet (*'ish Elohīm*, 'the man of God') will never fail in Israel. And his task is to continue the revelation which thus came to the people, to see that it is preserved in its original purity, and to decide upon its application. But Israel, which was chosen to become the recipient of a Divine revelation, shall never fail to receive it.

Yet the Decalogue, which had been thus solemnly commanded, was obviously quite unfitted to form the basis of a positive religion. Its purely negative character was enough to make this clear. In it the people were ordered jealously to reserve their worship to Yahweh alone, and in connexion with this worship were forbidden to employ any graven image. But they were not told how they ought to worship Him. The Sabbath law stopped short at forbidding all work on that day, but did not say how men must fill its empty hours. The moral laws concerned themselves merely with the vices which must be avoided. Even the most positive of these laws, which commanded honour to parents, did no more than preserve the family life. In preserving this, it formed the basis on which all further co-operation of a larger kind could be based. But it also needed supplement for a religion which was to guide a nation.

The ten words supply the framework or the necessary conditions within which a positive religion can develop: they do not supply the content of such a religion. They warn men against such things as would make impossible an ethical religion like that of Mosaism, and would prevent it from finding foothold and continuance in the nation. But, having done this, they do no more. For all the positive content of Israel's

religion Moses must still provide. Accordingly (v.³¹), he receives from Yahweh full instruction on the Law, the statutes and the judgments.¹ This law contains what is wanting in the ten words, the positive elements which make up the religion of the nation. These appear in their two leading forms, the *ḥuqqīm* or 'statutes,' which guide its cult, and the *mishpātīm* or 'judgments,' which determine its social conduct. And these together adequately describe the contents of the Code (chs. 12-16), in which the life of old Israel is regulated according to the principles of its religion. There the people's worship, in sacrifice and festival, in the place where it is offered and the forms by which it is conducted, as well as their social life in its organization under judge and king, in its attitude towards the poor and in its marriage customs, is all to be their own. And it is to be their own, because it is all fulfilled with the peculiar character of their religion.

Here, accordingly, there is mention of the land to which the people are going (vv.^{31, 33}). Previously there was nothing said about the land, because the Decalogue was valid for all time and every condition. But the statutes and judgments are designed for Palestine, and are framed to meet the needs and the dangers of the new conditions on which the people are entering. The distinctive life which characterizes Israel has come to them through no mere accident of their history, but is the embodiment of the Divine will to them. And on their loyal maintenance of it depends their future as a people.

The chapter is a unity, and the historical form into which it has been cast is no more than a form. In reality it is an effort to answer certain large questions about the national religion. Did the revelation at Horeb cease then, or does Israel live under a continuous revelation from its God? If the revelation is constant, and if it comes through prophets, are there any limits set to the change these prophets are at liberty to make? And is there a norm which can determine the legitimacy of any such changes? The actual religion practised in Canaan is not the religion practised by the fathers at Horeb. If this had been the case, there would have been no reason for Moses issuing a new law before the entry into the land. The writer is thinking out for his people the relation between

these two situations. The religion may not depart from its basis, as an ethical religion, in the ten words.

Clearly, then, the author had the two documents before him, the Code with its statutes and judgments and the Decalogue, for he was seeking to define the relation between them. That makes the chapter comparatively late. But it also shows that the document did not originally stand in the connexion in which it now appears. V.¹, which reads: 'Moses called unto all Israel and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day,' plainly forms an unsuitable preliminary to this far-reaching discussion of the relation between Code and Decalogue. The verse is an effort to fit the chapter into a new connexion. It is possible, on the other hand, that 6¹ was the original conclusion. For the discussion of the relation between Code and Decalogue might naturally end with the statement: 'This then is the commandment, viz. the statutes and judgments which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it.' In that case ch. 5 may have once formed an introduction to the Code which followed on here. On the other hand, the similarity of 6¹ to 5¹ raises the suspicion that it also is an addition of the editor who was finding a place for a very significant discussion. Then the chapter may once have been an independent document. And the fact that its writer speaks of Code and Decalogue as well-known and recognized guides for his people's religion, and speaks of their relation to one another, suggests at least that he was dealing with something other than an introduction. To determine the question, or at least to hope for an answer, it would be necessary to go wider, to examine other similar chapters and discover their character, and not to decide from one document alone. The difficult question of these preliminary chapters is far too involved and interlocked to admit of a ready answer on a narrow basis. It must remain open whether we have not before us a quantity of religious material, which gathered round the central Code and from which the men to whom we owe the Book in its present form made a selection, and preserved it in the shape of introduction. Certainly some of the material which is added at the close points in this direction.

At least it seems certain that, for whatever purpose the chapter was written or whatever place it was intended to occupy, it was composed after the Code had become the recognized guide for the

¹ Here, with Steuernagel, I follow the LXX and Sam. and omit the 'and' before the Statutes (cf. 6¹). We have not to deal with three magnitudes, law, statutes, judgments; we have only one, a law which consists of statutes and judgments.

nation's life. The questions with which it deals are such as spring up later in every faith. But further it reveals interesting points of contact with the prophetic teaching. The place the writer gives to prophecy and the way in which he regards it as inevitable in Israel, because Israel is in intimate relation to a self-revealing God, are the convictions of Amos. He could say that Yahweh was not content to give Israel a country: He gave it also prophets to let them know their task there (2^{9ff.}). In his judgment the prophet could no more hold his peace when Yahweh had spoken than a man could keep his nerves from twittering at a lion's roar (3⁸). And he bade the priest at Bethel recognize that it was hopeless to stop prophecy in Israel by police regulations. For, when Yahweh had a message for Israel, he would find a man to utter it. When He had no one else to send, He sent me. And every one knows where I spring from (7¹⁴).

Again, it was Amos who first made the distinction between the religion or morality which makes civilization possible, and the specific religion which Israel practised because it was chosen by Yahweh, and who made both the expression of the revealed will of God. For he saw Yahweh about to judge the nations as well as Israel, and having the right to call both to account. There was a relation of Yahweh to His world which was antecedent to the relation of Israel to Him. It was a relation which involved revelation and therefore judgment. To the writer of this chapter there is a Decalogue which is for all time and all conditions, and there is a religion which makes Israel's glory and life.

To find the author making such use of Amos' ideas on religion naturally raises the question whether there is any other evidence of the source from which the chapter has come. And the first is supplied by the language and by the historical material which has been drawn upon. Here one cannot do better than quote the judgment of Steuernagel in the second edition of his commentary, p. 72; 'In his representation of the situation D^{2b} (the author to whom Steuernagel ascribes the framework of the Decalogue) depends on the Elohist account in Ex 19; 20¹⁸⁻²¹; 24¹, though he leaves certain unessential features aside, while on the other hand he develops in his parenthetic interest the ideas brought forward by E.' The writer uses historical material from N. Israelite sources, and has been profoundly influenced by a N. Israelite prophet.

The document also contains a version of the Decalogue, which, while it agrees in essentials with

that in Exodus, differs in several minor details. The two derive from a common original, but have been modified somewhere by men who worked independently. Now it is impossible to enter fully here into the debate about the date of the source of the Ten Commandments. But one broad fact stares every student in the face, and demands explanation. How did the Hebrew law come to contain two separate and different versions of one of the fundamental documents of its religion? The natural explanation is that which has accounted for the duplicate narratives in Genesis, which in spite of their difference show evidence of being derived from a common tradition. The narratives of J and E were blended into a single history: the early laws of Judah and Israel were left here in their original integrity.

The gravest difficulty which stands in the way of accepting the Deuteronomic Decalogue as the N. Israelite version is that it contains a law which forbids the use of images. Those who relegate this Decalogue to a post-Exilic date can point to the fact that the Northern kingdom was identified from its beginning with the worship of Jeroboam's golden calves. They ignore, however, that the only voice in the nation, which was raised against this form of worship, was that of Hosea, the leading prophet of the North. It is acknowledged that the same prophet objected to the use of the name Baal for Yahweh, and that his protest was so successful as to lead to the disappearance of names like Ishbaal. His vigorous polemic against the calf-worship is the evidence of a deep-rooted objection to the practice, which found its clearest expression in him. The original form of the first law in the Decalogue may have been content to demand that Israel must reserve its entire allegiance to Yahweh—that is the primary demand in the Code. The law against the use of images will then be an addition directed against this special abuse. For such a development to be made in the original command at the bidding of the prophets will obviously be in entire agreement with the function and authority this chapter gives to the prophets.

Another evidence of the same successful protest is to be found in the story of the erection of the golden calf at Horeb. There the use of such emblems for worship is condemned from the very beginning, precisely as the practice of human sacrifice is repudiated in the great account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac. To me it is merely impossible to believe that an account which made Aaron the aider and abettor of the nation in such a deed could ever have been written in Jerusalem.

after the Exile, or, if it had been written, would ever have been admitted into the sacred literature. The temple authorities, who proudly boasted of a priesthood which derived from Aaron, would no more have written such an account than the Roman Catholic hierarchy, who derived their primacy from St. Peter, would have written an account which related the apostle's apostasy after his ordination. The story of the golden calf must date earlier than the Exile. It must even have been admitted into the combined records of the origins of Israel, J E, before the Return. It is a product of the same protest against the use of images, and its literary affinities are all with E.

The chapter has preserved for us the thought of a man who believed that his religion took its

origin in a direct revelation from God at Horeb, but who also knew that it had actually received the positive content of its sacrifices and all its institutions on its settlement in Palestine. He believed that the broad lines of this positive religion, by which he and his people lived, were laid down by Moses on the east of Jordan. When he tried to define the relation between these two events, he was inevitably driven to recognize that the revelation to Israel was progressive. And he believed that the medium of this continuous revelation was the prophetic succession. His doctrine of prophecy has thus certain affinities with the Christian doctrine of the Spirit in the Church. And, as the Code about which he wrote derives from N. Israel, so he belongs to the same kingdom.

Literature.

JEREMIAH.

MR. RAYMOND CALKINS has furnished us with what he believes, rightly enough, to be a desideratum by presenting an exposition of the Book of *Jeremiah the Prophet*, arranged, so far as possible, in chronological order (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). His further aim is to rescue the personality and work of Jeremiah from the obscurity in which the confusion of the traditional order of the book has unfortunately buried them. Though frankly admitting that 'chronology is difficult and always problematical in following the course of Jeremiah's career' (p. 122), he can fairly claim to have succeeded in both the tasks he set himself. He gives us a vivid picture of the man, his times, his struggles with himself, his people, and his God, his seeming failure, and his triumphant vindication at the bar of history. His debt to Peake, Skinner, and George Adam Smith, which is obvious throughout the discussion and which he fully acknowledges, in no way lessens the value of his book, as he has made the material his own; and his discussions of the Confessions of Jeremiah, of his attitude to the Deuteronomic Reform, and of the quality of his patriotism, are not only full of good sense and good judgment, but have their value—especially the discussion of patriotism—for the problems which confront us to-day. Only a sympathetic student of Jeremiah could have given us this book.

It is the more to be regretted that the book is

marred by occasional blemishes. Apart from six or seven slips in a page of bibliography, Gillies (on Jeremiah) is spelt throughout the book as Gilles, Qina appears twice as Quina (pp. 36, 70), Gedaliah as Gedeliah (p. 334), Pashhur as Pashhuh (p. 279), A. B. Davidson is twice referred to as A. B. Bruce (pp. 43, 46), and twice the fall of Nineveh is assigned to 607 B.C., instead of, as we now know, 612 (pp. 22, 166). On p. 27 we read, 'Zedekiah was made king after the brief interregnum of Jehoiakim who, after being king for three months, had his eyes put out by the Babylonians,' etc.; but it was Jehoiachin, not Jehoiakim (as Mr. Calkins correctly notes elsewhere, p. 365), who reigned for three months, and it was Zedekiah and not Jehoiachin who was blinded by the Babylonians. In certain places Mr. Calkins is too positive, as when he tells us that Jeremiah, 'like Jesus, was thirty years old' when he began his ministry (p. 75), and more particularly, when he tells us twice (pp. 8, 87 f.) that the prophetic party purposely hid Deuteronomy in the Temple, 'so as to give it added authority.' Many scholars would demur to this statement, and Mr. Calkins would have been better advised to adopt Skinner's view to which he alludes, and which, while offending no prejudice, is intrinsically more reasonable. In the bibliography we miss a reference to Professor Welch's fine study of Jeremiah, from which Mr. Calkin's own study would have profited. But, apart from these strictures, it may justly be said that Mr. Calkins has given us a thoroughly

useful book, from which preachers especially might derive much fruitful suggestion in preparing a course of sermons on the man whom Mr. Calkins describes as 'in many respects, the greatest of the prophets.'

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A sense of bewilderment will surely come to those who read *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, edited by the Very Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, Dean of Canterbury (Murray; 7s. 6d. net). The book is a symposium, to which men of various schools have contributed. There are some of decided liberal tendencies like Dr. Sheppard himself, others as decidedly Anglo-Catholic, and others who may be called middle-men. Among the best known names are the Rev. F. S. M. Bennett, Dean of Chester, Canon Quick, Dr. F. R. Barry, Dr. Raven, Dr. J. K. Mozley, and Canon Woods. Distinguished as these men are, we should greatly have liked to hear others who, for various reasons, were unable to respond to Dr. Sheppard's invitation, such as Dean Inge, Dr. Major, Dr. Streeter, and Mr. Sidney Dark. The bewilderment we spoke of will be caused by the extraordinary diversity of the views expressed. 'There are, it may be, so many voices in this world,' says St. Paul, 'and none of them is without signification.' And that is true of the writers of this volume. They are all significant, but in what diverse ways!

All the contributors have their weather-eye on the coming Conference at Canterbury, and while they all humbly repudiate the very idea of giving advice to the bishops, they at once proceed to do so in no uncertain fashion. One thinks liberty of thought the great need of the Church of England; another, spiritual revival; and several a broader basis for the Church which will leave the door wide open to Free Churchmen. The 'Bridge' conception of the English Church is often employed, and Dr. Parsons (his is perhaps the very best of all the essays) suggests that the end of the bridge facing the Nonconformists ought to be attended to at once. But the Anglo-Catholics point out that nobody lives on a bridge, but only on the land at each end. Moreover, the Anglo-Catholics want toleration that will include them, but they carefully eschew any discussion of interchange of ministries, and do not even mention the South Indian proposal which figures in nearly all the other essays. Reunion, indeed, is discussed by almost all the writers, but with quite opposite policies frequently. Canon Mozley seems to have altogether given up

hope of reunion with the Free Churches, but in this frank statement he stands nearly alone.

What is the upshot? As impartial commentators we should say that two impressions are left on the mind by this extraordinary book. One is that the Church of England is marvellously comprehensive to include such opposites. It is a pity it cannot be even more so and include a little more! The other is that any hope of real reunion between the English Church and the Free Churches seems utterly remote. The Anglo-Catholics advocate a federation of churches, but they would not remain in a Church which recognized Free Church orders. Our conclusion may be pessimistic, and the future may hold something better than this volume promises. But at any rate, when you listen to these discordant voices, you are apt to see only the clouds in the sky.

A STUDY IN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

The Rev. E. O. James, Ph.D., D.Litt., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Oxford, who has recently published *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* (Mowbray; 7s. 6d. net), is well known as an expert writer on anthropology and folklore. In this new work he seeks to place before the student and the general reader a brief account of the Christian Faith, presented in loyalty to the revelation that has been given in the past, and at the same time in conformity with the new knowledge of the present age. His chapters deal successively with the physical universe, the evolutionary process, the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Incarnation, sin, and redemption, resurrection and immortality, the Church and the ministry, the origins of the sacraments, magic and religion, the saints and the supernatural, the last-named considering in particular the doctrine of the invocation of saints.

All the chapters are informative, and indeed some of them are so close-packed with information that they are apt to lose coherence in places. Less attention to the historical and more to the positive would have enabled Dr. James to give us a more valuable book. As it is, we have here a prolegomena rather than a substantial contribution to scientific theology. But while we say this, we are grateful to him for what he has given us. The matter is fresh and up to date, and very useful lists of relevant books are appended to each of the chapters.

It would appear that Dr. James asks to be regarded as an exponent of liberal orthodoxy or critical catholicism. Either phrase suits him well.

He is obviously in general sympathy with the writers who contributed to 'Essays Catholic and Critical.' But in view of his pronounced ecclesiastical sympathies we should be inclined to interpolate 'Anglican' between liberal and orthodoxy, or between critical and catholicism.

Dr. James offers us some reflections in his concluding chapter, entitled 'The Christian Faith and the Modern World,' on the question whether historic Christianity, and institutional religion generally, will survive the dissemination in the new age of what Jung calls 'directed thinking,' as distinguished from 'phantasy thinking.' It is his belief that the ancient Creeds of the united Church represent the best statements of the permanent Faith of Christendom, and that this Faith is independent of any particular philosophy or world-view; but that nevertheless a reconsideration and restatement of the terms of the permanent elements enshrined in the older categories of thought are imperative requirements of the age. This is the 'liberal orthodox' position, and it is well expressed in these words: 'The tendency of Protestant Liberalism is to break away from the religious experience of historic Christianity, whereas the Liberal Catholic takes his stand upon the fundamental beliefs of Christendom as set forth authoritatively by the whole Church at Nicæa and Chalcedon, employing the methods now current in the learned world to interpret in the light of fuller knowledge the Faith as it has been received throughout the ages.' From such a standpoint the Nicene Creed and the Chalcedonian definition are 'the lowest common multiple of belief' in a reunited Church.

A THEOLOGICAL THRILLER.

A story used to be current about what happened in the course of a well-known heresy case in Scotland some thirty years ago. The heretic, who had written a book that aroused much dissatisfaction, was tried before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. In a committee room his counsel and supporters were gathered for consultation, and the counsel (a famous advocate) turning to the accused, said: 'Mr. Blank, I do not quite understand your views on the Resurrection. Do you believe that Christ rose from the dead?' To which the accused replied: 'I believe His *spirit* rose.' Whereupon the famous lawyer turned upon him with, 'And who on earth ever heard of a spirit being buried?' Only he did not say 'on earth.' That irritated outburst expresses

fairly well the feeling of many people when they hear that, while the physical resurrection is not true, there was a spiritual resurrection. All the evidence we have, they conclude, is evidence for a physical resurrection and no other kind. And they find it impossible to get over one obstinate fact—the empty tomb.

This conclusion has been immensely fortified by one of the most remarkable books that have appeared for many years—*Who Moved the Stone?*—by Mr. Frank Morison (Faber & Faber; 6s. net). When it is sufficiently advertised it will certainly be one of the best sellers of this or many other years. We have not read any book for long that rivals it in sheer absorbing fascination. Who the author is we do not know. From the close texture of his argument and his relentless logic we should not be surprised to learn that he is a successful lawyer. If not, he ought to be! Probably the most outstanding feature of his book is the vividness of his narrative. You are carried on with breathless interest from point to point, and you actually *see* many of the incidents in the Gospels as if you had been present. But as soon as one has said that, one questions whether another feature is not more prominent, the tenacious grip of realities and the piercing vision into their significance.

Mr. Morison set out years ago to write a book on 'Jesus: The Last Phase' which would dispose of the supernatural aspects of the story. But as he pondered it, and searched into the evidence, it convinced him against his will of the contrary conclusion. And so that book was never written, and this one shaped itself in his mind in its place. It may seem a strong thing to say, but the impression left on the mind after two readings of the book is that it has settled the question so far as mere argument and evidence can do so.

Among other things, one of the main features of Mr. Morison's treatment is his perception and use of what he calls 'submerged facts.' As an instance there is the fact that, if the tomb was not empty, all the agitation and conflict of ideas were conducted in the actual and physical presence of the remains of Jesus. And not only so, but the disciples came with their assertion of Christ's resurrection into the very city where it could have been disproved, where any one could have gone between supper and bedtime and found definite confutation. Moreover, if Jesus still lay in His tomb, why (asks the writer) did it not become a focus for devotion? Why was it never visited? Why did it sink into oblivion? We have given this as an example of the extraordinary insight of the author into facts

that lie beneath the surface. But it would be impossible to summarize the argument itself, so closely woven is it. It is enough to say that the whole process of events, from the arrest of Jesus, through His trial to His resurrection, is set before the reader with a power, a picturesqueness, and a thrill that make the book rival in interest a detective novel. Yet the tone and spirit are all the time deeply serious, and one receives the impression that the author is a searcher for truth at all costs. We may end by expressing the hope that after a time, when the book has passed through its inevitable editions, it may be possible to issue it at a price cheap enough to send it broadcast through the land.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE TRINITY.

An argument for the Trinity has frequently been based on the three constituent elements of personality—Thought, Will, and Feeling—but nowhere has it been worked out so fully and suggestively as it is by the Rev. Hubert M. Foston, D.Lit. (Lond.), in his new work *Man and the Image of God* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). Some time ago Dr. Foston published an interesting book, 'The Evening of the Last Supper' (1928), in which it was urged that the gospel narratives must be studied from the biological standpoint as well as from that of purely literary criticism, inasmuch as the documents imply a living process. The suggestion gave the reviewers no little trouble, and it is useful to recall this because the same gift for tracing subtle analogies finds fuller scope in the new volume. Dr. Foston first studies the psychological process of perception, and argues that the ideas of 'manifestation,' 'presentation,' and 'intelligibility' are precisely those brought before us in the Person of the Son, who is described in the New Testament by such terms as 'image' and 'word.' In the same way the conative process of attention and the experience of feeling have their counterparts in the activities of the Spirit and of the Father respectively. The inseparable relations between the cognitive, conative, and affective processes are also exemplified in the unity of the Triune Persons.

This is an impressive argument, but Dr. Foston carries the analogy further. The New Testament views the natural creation as coming into being through the Son; it is therefore all the more striking to note parallels between the 'products' of our intellectual life—percepts, images, and reasoned thoughts—and the natural phenomena present in the vegetable, animal, and human

worlds. The analogies are significant when we read that the Creative Word 'was life' and that 'the life was the light of men.' Again, the existence of self-conscious thinking in the intellectual scale awakens the expectation in the cosmic scale of 'some fundamental triune form of Reality, underlying all nature, as the triunity of mind underlies all intellectual organization and development,' and it is surely 'a most extraordinary fact' that the doctrine of the Trinity was formulated before such a comparison was worked out.

This last point precludes the explanation of the Trinity as a matter of mental projection. 'In actual history the declaration of the Trinity in the form of a revelation came *first*; and now afterwards the natural facts are seen in a complex way to corroborate it.' The argument is thus not merely one of analogy, but 'the confirmation of old-standing definite statement through a network of afterwards recognised facts.' 'Nature and mind together are so shaped as to hold a niche uniquely for the doctrine of the Trinity' (p. 141). Christian thoughts which possess such a 'balanced ultimacy' cannot be the accidents of theological vagary, and the bearing of such considerations is to raise again questions which may have been dismissed in too much haste.

This bare outline will, perhaps, serve to indicate the rich suggestiveness of Dr. Foston's fine book, but no summary can do justice to the manner in which he develops his thoughts. He delights to hold them up to the light, and asks you to look at them from as many angles as possible. If an objection or a difficulty is raised, he will track it down and reveal some unsuspected positive suggestion in it, and everywhere his argument is illuminated by striking illustrations from natural science, astronomy, and philosophy. In some ways the most difficult, but certainly the profoundest, part of the discussion is the chapter on 'The Likeness of Love in the Universe,' where Dr. Foston seeks to show that all the ranges of Nature seem to point as their climax to a participation in the likeness of God as Love. Self-sufficient in appearance, the universe finds its principle of harmonization beyond itself and only in God.

PAGAN AFRICA.

The Evangelization of Pagan Africa, by Professor J. Du Plessis, Litt.D., D.D. (Juta & Co., Cape Town; Walker Bros., London; 16s.), is a most painstaking and meritorious work. The field covered is not so wide as the title would perhaps

suggest. Africa may be divided into two nearly equal portions by a line drawn from the mouth of the Niger to the southern extremity of the Red Sea. North of that line we have, broadly speaking, Muhammadan Africa, south of that line Pagan Africa. The present work deals only with the latter. Still further, its scope is limited by the fact that in a previous volume Professor Du Plessis has dealt with 'Christian Missions in South Africa.' Consequently he here confines himself to mission work in West, Central, and East Africa. His treatment of the subject is characterized by great accuracy and fullness of detail. No other work can be named which covers the ground so adequately. Book I., which is devoted to a history of 'the age of discovery' and the slave trade, though most interesting, seems unnecessarily full. On the other hand, the failure to make any but passing references to Livingstone's travels in Central Africa is a grave omission, even though his work may have been treated in a previous volume. The author complains of unavoidable delay in the publication of his book, and there are evidences here and there that his narrative has not been brought quite up to date, particularly in regard to the work done in German mission fields since the War. The fact remains, however, that here we have a work of outstanding merit and of real historical value, a work which should find a place in every missionary library.

THE DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY.

The Rev. Professor C. V. Pilcher, D.D., of Wycliffe College, Toronto, was set a hard task when he was invited to contribute to the R.T.S. Devotional Commentary on the Bible edited by the Rev. C. H. Irwin, D.D., the volume on *Hosea, Joel, Amos* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net). The devotional mind can play more readily on a book like the Psalms than on the historical or prophetic books; and when to the difficulties inherent in the nature of the material is added, in the case of *Hosea* at any rate, the peculiarly perplexing nature of the text, the real magnitude of Dr. Pilcher's task will be appreciated. In our judgment he has solved his problem with complete success by reducing the purely devotional comment to a minimum. He has wisely chosen to present as vividly as possible the prophets and their messages rather than to talk piously about them, in the confidence that what *they* say, when we understand it, is more effective than anything that *we* can say by way of exposition or elaboration.

Dr. Pilcher offers a translation of the three prophets assigned to him, a translation which obviously rests on real knowledge and scholarship, as does also the brief exposition which follows. The short chapters are prefaced by titles which, while bright and attractive, are really suggestive and never sensational; for example, *Israel's Indian Summer*, *King-Makers and King-Murderers* (*Hos 7⁴⁻⁷*), *The Fear of the Dark* (*Am 6*). The writer is obviously well acquainted with Sellin's work, and, reading between the lines, one can easily see that he is abreast of contemporary literature on the Old Testament. The result is a commentary which is devotional in the best sense, because it respects the facts of history and criticism as well as the facts of sin, judgment, mercy, and God.

HAUNTING YEARS.

The public conscience has been stirred to revolt against recent books about the men who gave their lives to win the war. We have raised monuments of every kind in their honour; yet the famous war correspondent Sir Philip Gibbs has been moved to ask, 'When we stand bare-headed in the Two Minutes' Silence are we honouring the men whose courage was due to excess of alcohol, who lost all moral discipline in France and Flanders and were drunkards and debauchees behind the lines?' He protests emphatically that this is a slander and a libel upon the army of our youth who left these shores for the most desperate ordeal men have ever faced. At such a time we are glad to welcome another first-hand testimony to the same effect in a volume *Haunting Years: The Commentaries of a War Territorial*, by W. Linton Andrews, now the distinguished editor of 'The Leeds Mercury' (Hutchinson; 7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Andrews, though a Yorkshireman, was on the editorial staff of a Dundee paper when the war broke out, and at once he joined the territorial battalion of the famous Black Watch and served with it on the Western Front for three most eventful years before coming home to train for an officer's commission. This is the faithful, frank, unvarnished tale of a ranker, the unconsciously self-drawn portrait of a true Christian soldier, encouraging the weak and frightened, standing out against injustice and doing the hateful job of fighting in the spirit of a crusader. 'Remember,' he writes, 'this is not my own story alone: it is the story of many thousands of others. We did not go into battle like the brute beasts that perish,

like sheep going to the slaughter, but in what might be our last hours thought very tenderly of those at home.' Mr. Andrews has the gift of terse and vivid narrative. He takes his reader with him into the trenches and makes him realize in some measure the unspeakable horrors of that kind of warfare. It is clear that he had the fine gift of comradeship. Nothing shows this better than his tributes to the officers under whom and the men with whom he counts it an abiding honour to have served.

Those who have the responsibility of leading the devotions of worshippers in the sanctuary need all the help they can get, especially in churches where 'free prayer' is the rule. For these *When Praying in the Holy Place*, by the Rev. George Blair, B.D. (Allenson; 6s. net), will be a real boon. Mr. Blair has collected a series of prayers which he has written and used himself in the course of his ministry. To these he has added a number of complete Communion services, prayers for special occasions and orders for the chief Church festivals. We have nothing but praise for this excellent manual—at least almost nothing. Our one criticism is that many of the prayers are too long. But even this has an advantage, as it increases the amount of material to be drawn upon. There is little that is liturgical in these devotions, but they are good examples of the best kind of unwritten prayers characteristic of the freer sort of service.

The Life of our Lord, by Mr. Reginald G. Ponsonby (Bell; 3s. 6d. net), is a harmony compiled from the four Gospels in such a way as to present one continuous narrative. Where any episode is narrated by more than one Evangelist, Mr. Ponsonby takes the fullest account and supplements it by the narratives of the other Evangelists when they give additional information or add some graphic touch. No doubt this procedure is open to critical objections, and as a matter of fact it leads to rather odd results, as when, for example, the Lukan Preface is immediately followed by the Johannine Prologue; but the result as a whole is to give a readable and vivid narrative which cannot fail to arrest the attention. Without comment or explanation the text is left to speak for itself, but at the end of the book a few additional notes, a table of parallel sections, a list of parallel passages, and a useful map are given. An interesting Preface to the work is given by Sir Wilfred Grenfell, who points out that 'Youth, in the hustle of these

days, needs increasingly just what this book attempts to afford,' and tells us that the compiler is a layman, of a brilliant mind, who for several years has worked with the object of meeting that need. With Sir Wilfred we wish the book every success and a place 'not merely in every wise man's library, but on every earnest man's table.'

We have pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to the appearance of the second edition of the Rev. W. L. Paige Cox's valuable and timely discussion of *The Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord* (Blackwell; 1s. net), on the first edition of which we commented favourably some months ago. It is a reasoned and scholarly protest against the widely disseminated doctrine that 'Christ is continually offering Himself to the Father, and that the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is the earthly counterpart of that offering.' This discussion, temperate as it is, has evoked indignant and abusive criticism from those against whose view Mr. Cox has so convincingly argued, and this criticism he answers in a carefully written appendix, in which he takes the opportunity to develop his argument further. The original pamphlet created no little stir, and apparently the writer has the support of some of the best scholars in the Church; and he seems to us to have the New Testament on his side—which is of much more importance.

Who Wrote the Fourth Gospel? is a résumé of the positive evidence for the Apostolic authorship, published by the Board of Religious Education of the Presbyterian Church of Australia. Its author, the Rev. Alexander Yule, M.A., of Balwyn, Melbourne, hopes that his restatement of the evidence will lead earnest inquirers to the same overwhelming conviction which lights up his own mind and gladdens his heart. The main stress of the argument lies on the external evidence and the witness of the Gospel itself to the fact that it is the work of a Palestinian Jew and an Apostolic eye-witness. The best chapter is that which discusses, and rejects, the alleged testimony of Philip of Side to the martyrdom of the Apostle. Mr. Yule adopts the view that the well-known quotation from Papias given by Eusebius does not imply the existence of 'two Johns.' 'Personally,' he says, 'I must class "John the Presbyter"' with the famous Mrs. Harris of *Martin Chuzzlewit*. I find it increasingly difficult to suppose that there was any "such a person." The argument of the pamphlet is spirited and well informed, but it does not fully come to grips with the objections to the Apostolic authorship, and fails to con-

sider the alternative view that the Gospel may rest on the tradition of John without actually being the product of his pen.

Many years ago a booklet, *The Babylonian Story of the Deluge and the Epic of Gilgamesh*, was written by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. As there has been a considerable advance in our knowledge of Babylonian matters since then, the brochure has been revised by Mr. C. J. Gadd, the Assistant-Keeper in the Department, and it is now re-issued under the same title (Trustees of the British Museum; 1s. 6d. net). An excellent account is first given of the Royal Libraries at Nineveh, with specimens of the tablets in cuneiform. The twelve tablets of the Gilgamesh Epic are next described and summarized, and the Legend of the Deluge, as contained on the eleventh one, is given, both in the original and in an English translation. The version of the Legend according to Berosus is also rendered in full translation for purposes of comparison. Apart from the Gilgamesh Epic, it is shown that other versions or recensions of the Deluge Legend existed both in Sumerian and Babylonian as early as 2000 B.C., such as those published by Scheil and Poebel. The theory, no doubt correct, is advanced that the original event commemorated in the Legend was 'a serious and prolonged inundation or flood in and over Babylonia, which was accompanied by great loss of life and destruction of property.' Altogether the brochure is an excellent and welcome compendium of information of an authoritative nature, and should be of deep interest, not only to Old Testament students, but to the general reader.

Here is a live book upon vital subjects, packed with the kind of facts that one is always wanting and has not lying to his hand—*The Dawning Epoch*, by the Rev. Archibald Chisholm, D.Litt. (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net).

It consists of a series of studies on the big questions of the hour. The Future of Western Civilization faces the difficulties of the time with a bold hope, built not a little upon knowledge of former crises thought in their day to be the end. The Foundations of World Peace—lucid and well informed; The Reform of the Stock Exchange—sane where much sheer unreason is too often chattered; Expenditure and Social Well-Being, starting from the despondency with which many, who a little while ago were quite confident that they had found the long-desired solution of the world's problem, are now regarding their old theories with doubtful eyes—

among them one notices State Socialism is included; Christian Principles in Industry, and what is being attempted; and the Witness of Protestantism—make up a set of fresh and informing chapters that rush us on to an almost abrupt end.

Those who watch the issue of current theological literature must have been struck by the intensity and strength of the Roman Catholic propaganda. The same observant persons must have been rather surprised to find so little of a contrary nature from the Protestant side. This lack is supplied, so far as one book can do it, by an excellent volume, *Inside the Roman Church*, by One who was There, Mr. J. W. Poynter, formerly a prominent Roman Catholic writer (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). This is a powerful examination of Roman Catholic claims. And the impression it produces is intensified by the obvious fairness and restraint with which the writer conducts his investigation. All the main positions are scrutinized—the claim to Papal infallibility, the Roman doctrine of the Sacraments, and all the rest—and they are dealt with calmly and with relentless logic. The book is not fanatical or prejudiced. The author was for years a Roman, and it was his honest examination of the evidence for the purpose of answering Protestant objections that convinced him of the instability of the Roman case. This volume deserves a wide circulation and a careful consideration.

Mr. H. E. Bryant, B.A., formerly Headmaster of Brigg Grammar School, is much to be congratulated on his competent translation of 2 Cor. in *New Light on an Old Letter* (Epworth Press; 8d.). The translation is based almost entirely on the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and is not only a close modern rendering, but a piece of good English as well. Where Mr. Bryant finds it necessary to make a paraphrase, or to introduce an explanatory phrase, he gives the reason in a footnote and often adds a more literal translation. An excellent brief Introduction describes the character of the Epistle and the circumstances of its composition. Reference is also made to the 'painful letter' probably embodied in 10-13¹⁰, and to the earlier fragment in 6¹⁴-7¹. The translation would form an excellent guide for a Study Circle, and the individual reader will find it an interesting and valuable help to the understanding of what Mr. Bryant justly describes as 'the most self-revealing' of St. Paul's letters.

We are now favoured with volume iii. of the *Excavations at Kish* (Geuthner, Paris; 60 fr.).

Volume ii. has meantime been delayed, but the present volume contains the results of the expedition to Mesopotamia in 1925-27, undertaken by the Herbert Weld archaeologists from the University of Oxford and those from the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. The account of the excavations is presented by L. Ch. Watelin, and the epigraphical notes and selection of contracts are given by Professor Langdon of Oxford, the Director of the expedition. It was during the next expedition (the sixth) that the enormous age of the site at Kish was revealed, and that the chief period of Sumerian civilization was found to be pre-diluvian. For below the red stratum, right beneath the wide excavations, lies a layer of sand deposited by a great flood, and from there, through a layer twenty feet thick to water-level, the excavators came across the brick tombs of the mighty men of Kish, dating from at least 5000 B.C. It is clear that the huge ruins of Kish, scattered over an area of five miles long, contain secrets of the utmost importance, and future researches will be awaited with much interest. The volume is enriched with numerous plates, and also copies of the cuneiform tablets unearthed. It is beautifully printed and well finished, and the Parisian publishers deserve much credit for the production.

Since the publication of Dr. Rawlinson's 'St. Mark' we have had an expectant and admiring mind about him. His little book, *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (Longmans; 5s. net), is not a great achievement, but it exhibits his best qualities—sound scholarship, tolerance, and a real concern about the best things. There are four chapters: one on 'The Church of Christ,' another on 'The Church of England,' a third on 'Movements and Tendencies within the Church,' and the last on 'The Anglican Church and the Future.' Dr. Rawlinson writes with appreciation of all the 'Movements' that can be called Christian, and shows that in many ways they have something to contribute to the common stock. But the things he has to say are mainly about the Anglican Church. He is very definite in his rejection of Roman errors; quite severe, also, in his rebuke of extremists of all kinds in his own Church. But he both loves and admires his Church, and much of his concluding chapter is devoted to an earnest plea for the improvement of its resources. He specially urges the better education of the clergy, of whose average intellectual gifts he does not seem to cherish an unqualified admiration. Members of the Church of England will do well to heed the warnings and

exhortations the author addresses to them. And others who wish to know what a broad and cultured Christian mind thinks of 'these discontents' will find it recorded with a certain sweet and humble firmness here.

Richard Rolle is, of course, a notable figure in English literature and religion. And it is well to have a selection of his writings in a handy form—*Richard Rolle, Selected Works* (Longmans; 8s. 6d. net). There is a competent introduction, somewhat marred by a rather querulous spirit towards other people than its subject, and a couple of hundred pages of selections, occasionally lit by a flash of something like genius. But, on the whole, Rolle is not among the greatest, and can be even dull.

There was a time when the essay was a favourite form of literature. Many of us remember the joy of Stevenson's books, and further back of Hazlitt and Lamb. To-day a blight seems to have fallen on this kind of writing. There are few essayists of the old manner, and that is our loss. But occasionally one comes along, and we may hail him with a sincere welcome. *Without Prejudice*, by Mr. S. G. Dunn (Luzac; 3s. 6d. net), reveals much of the real art of the essayist. It is genial and wise and penetrating, and whether the writer is dealing with dreams, or 'being oneself,' or 'living a double life,' or 'taking the road,' or 'the case against spiritualism,' he has always something shrewd and wise to say, and says it in graceful and suggestive words. The book will give pleasure, and, it may be hoped, not a little profit, to those who love to reflect on life and to read the reflections of a thoughtful and discerning mind.

In *George of Lydda, the Patron Saint of England* (Luzac; 12s. net), by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of Assyrian and Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum, we have a study of the cultus of St. George in Ethiopia, along with thirteen plates, an introduction, and translations of the Ethiopic texts found in the manuscripts from Makdalâ. Since the early eighties of last century it has been realized that the Oriental Versions of the history and martyrdom of George of Lydda are the sources of the western stories and afford us the correct knowledge of his life. On this account, the present volume, containing the full text of the Ethiopic Version, supplies an undoubted want. It gives the narrative of St. George's martyrdom,

a short history of the founding of the Church and Shrine of St. George at Lydda, and the long encomium on him by Bishop Theodotus. All the evidence available, as the volume shows, tends to prove that the legend of St. George in its oldest form contains the story of the life and death of a Christian martyr, which was written for the instruction of Christians. On this story were grafted portions of legends of gods and heroes and supernatural beings, and much of the original form of the legend was destroyed in the process. St. George fought no dragon, but as the Hero of Christendom, the scribes were obliged to invent one for him. The book forms volume xx. of Luzac's 'Semitic Text and Translation' Series, but a few copies may be had without the Ethiopic text. No one could have done the work better than Sir Wallis Budge, who has specialized in such matters, and the book deserves a wide circulation among all interested in the early growth of Christianity.

Professor Richard M. Vaughan of Newton Theological Seminary believes that 'no aspect of modern life is more significant than the increasing recognition of personality.' In this persuasion he has written a most interesting and valuable work, *The Significance of Personality* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), in which the idea is taken as a principle of interpretation, in the conviction that it makes possible a world view which best meets the demands of philosophy, religion, and ethics. Personality is presented as the clue to the doctrines of God and Man, the Incarnation and the Atonement, to the experiences of Forgiveness, Faith, and Renewal, and to the problems of Immortality and Certainty in Religion. This is obviously an ambitious project. Professor Vaughan pursues his aim with a very great measure of success, although its price appears to be a modal interpretation of the Trinity and an immanent view of the Person of Christ. From beginning to end, the book is full of striking and arresting thoughts. The illustrations are apt and numerous; the style is clear and incisive, and the essays are well sprinkled with the pleasing salt of epigram. Wide as the range of subject-matter is, the interest is sustained throughout, and it is impossible to read the book without being moved and even excited. Not the least attractive feature is its reasoned optimism. Professor Vaughan believes, and makes us believe, that 'the great days of the church are ahead,' and that 'the signs are multiplying that a Wind from heaven is moving with fresh power upon the hearts of men in all lands.'

In *The Origins of the Druze People and Religion* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), by Professor Philip K. Hitti, Ph.D., of Princeton University (formerly of the American University of Beirut), which makes volume xxviii. of the 'Columbia University Oriental Studies,' we have a competent attempt made to solve the riddle of this strange national-religious body, which has lived for about nine hundred years in Syria. Various theories have been advanced to account for their peculiar doctrines and customs, but they have always remained the great mystery of the Lebanon mountains. Dr. Hitti was born in the Lebanon, and Arabic is his native tongue. As a boy and a young man he associated with the Druzes, and still has access to their literature. On this account he is probably better fitted than any other scholar to solve the enigma as to who they are and what they believe. The study of this book is especially valuable and interesting because of the historical connexion of Druzism with Christianity and eastern Christian sects. In its development, Druzism became heir to a number of Zoroastrian and Judæo-Christian tenets, as well as to a body of Hellenistic and Persian philosophy. The basic fundamentals of Druze theology are, therefore, paralleled by corresponding Christian dogmas. In this way, as the author shows, there is after all nothing very mysterious in the 'Asian mystery,' and the 'great enigma' lends itself to solution. The book contains extracts and facsimiles from the Druze sacred writings, together with a map and index.

The last half-century has witnessed a great revival of interest in the life and work of John Wyclif, the translator of the Bible. The interest has been characterized by the historical and critical spirit of the age, which endeavours to place the outstanding men of the past in their own background. Professor S. Harrison Thomson, Ph.D., B.Litt., of the California Institute of Technology, has rendered an excellent service to Wyclif by publishing the latter's *Summa de Ente*, Book I., the First and Second Tractates, with critical notes and introduction, from the two extant manuscripts (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). We have already had no less than thirty-five of the great reformer's Latin works published under the distinguished auspices of the Wyclif Society (dissolved in 1924), but a large quantity of his writings still remains to be edited. Unfortunately, some of them are lost, but the *Summa de Ente* has been preserved complete; and in the introduction to the present edition of the first two tractates (which are now

edited for the first time), Professor Thomson lays Wyclif's philosophy before the interested reader, explaining what the reformer meant by such fundamental concepts as Being and Existence, and giving an outline of the argument. Like the valuable works on Wyclif by Professor Gotthard Lechler and those of the Wyclif Society, the present volume shows a high level of excellence and sheds much light on Wyclif's processes of thought and his development from schoolman to reformer.

We extend to Mr. F. H. Wales's translation of *The Psalms, Book IV.* (Milford; 1s. net), the same cordial welcome as we have already extended to his translations of the first three books. It is characterized by the same scholarship and the same sensitiveness to the music of words. His deviations from the traditional text, which in this book are not many, are justified either by the textual facts or by reasonable textual conjectures; for example, Ps 100^a, 'He hath made us, and *His we are*' (so substantially R.V.) is unquestionably correct, as against A.V. 'and not we ourselves.' So 'we bring our years to an end *as a breath*' (90^a) is much more accurate than 'as a tale that is told'; but 'as a murmur' or 'sigh' would have been better still. There are points at which we should differ from Mr. Wales; for example, the LXX and the demonological implications of Ps 90 incline us to prefer 'the pest or *the demon of noon*' in v.⁶ to 'the woe that wasfeth at noon.' Also in 104²⁶ the nature of the context and the parallelism seem to justify the emendation of 'ships' into 'sea-monsters,' and in the poetic account of creation (104⁸) 'mountain rose, valleys sank down'—though this involves the transposition of v.⁸ and v.⁹—seems preferable to 'they go up the hills, they go down the vales.' But these and similar points are largely matters of opinion, and possibly Mr. Wales does well to err on the conservative side. Among the many felicities of language may be noted his rendering of 106²⁴, 'they disdained the land of delight.'

A book of popular apologetic which will be helpful in orthodox Anglican circles has been written by the Rev. Ernest Evans, B.D., and published by John Murray, *A Reason for the Faith: Offered to the Young Men and Women of England* (5s. net). The standpoint is that of definite and complete orthodoxy, tempered a little by a somewhat broader view of Scripture. The writer believes that 'truth of doctrine and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the exercise of the ministry is possible, come from

above, not from below, being derived from the Apostles, who received them from Christ Himself.' There is either a lack of candour or of scholarship in the statement, 'It is not clearly established that Bishops and Presbyters were different Orders, though the balance of probability is in favour of that opinion,' and in the other statement, that we cannot say that Paul ever considered it certain that the end would come in his days. There are some quaint views here and there, as that the baptismal service is the only service at which an unbaptized person may be present, or, again, in the suggestion that, though the consummation of all things is greatly to be desired, yet out of consideration for those who are not ready, God is delaying the accomplishment of it. But on the whole this is an earnest and able attempt to present the Catholic faith in a fashion acceptable to the mind of teachable youth.

Helps to teachers of all kinds are coming constantly from the press, and they are all welcome, for teachers cannot have too much assistance, provided it is based on experience and training. *Hints to Teachers*; Talks on Sunday School Teaching, by Mr. J. T. Newton (National Sunday School Union; 2s. net), has its own merits. The chapters are perhaps too brief; no subject is pursued far enough; but the counsel given is for the most part sound, and the points selected show that the counsel comes from one who has teaching experience behind him. There are nineteen chapters, which include a good deal of mild psychology, but also shrewd 'tips' about the preparation of lessons, the use of maps, story-telling, and other topics. The treatment is suggestive, and if the teacher 'asks for more' he will at least be set off thinking on reasonable lines.

The Rev. J. Garrow Duncan, B.D., who has rendered long and conspicuous service to the archæology of Palestine, and particularly of Jerusalem, has presented in popular form some of the results of his exploration and reading in a book entitled *The Accuracy of the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). He believes that archæological study is as necessary as linguistic, and indeed acts as a valuable check upon results reached by linguistic or literary criticism. Obscurities of the text are frequently due not to the writer's ignorance but to our own, and archæology, he maintains, not seldom confirms the accuracy of statements, especially about the early period of Hebrew history, on which scholars had cast doubt. Among other things Mr. Duncan discusses the peoples and the conquest of Palestine, but he is particularly full in dealing with

the topography of Jerusalem, especially of Ophel, and with the strategy by which David captured the city. There is a useful chapter on the influence of Canaanite religion upon the Hebrews, which discusses teraphim, standing-stones, altars, serpent-worship, and sun-worship; and he gives a vivid imaginative description of how Samson destroyed the temple of Dagon. It is difficult to see why Mr. Duncan prefers A.V.'s 'grove' to R.V.'s 'asherah.'

The book is greatly enriched by forty excellent illustrations. To his proof of the early use of writing, Mr. Duncan might have added Jg 8¹⁴, which is the more valuable as it is quite incidental. Gen. xxvii. should be corrected to xxxvii. (p. 56), 'conquered' to 'conquered' (p. 66), τέλειος to τέλειος (p. 101), and Jer. cxiv. to xlv. (p. 149). The book contains scores of facts which will be interesting to those to whom archæology is a sealed book.

A good case can be made out for episcopacy on grounds of expediency and experience and common sense. Indeed, there are many Presbyterians to-day who, on these grounds, would welcome episcopal government. In the original form of Scottish Presbyterianism, as designed by Knox, 'superintendents' were a feature, and these were only bishops under another name. But the case for episcopacy is upheld by many on a very different ground, and this ground is taken with firmness in *The Case for Episcopacy*, by Mr. Kenneth D. Mackenzie (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Here is the position in a few words: 'The Episcopal Orders which we desire to share with all other orthodox Christians are not merely a ministry directed by bishops, but a ministry derived, as we believe, through bishops from our Lord Himself.' In maintaining this position the writer commits himself to many questionable statements. To take only one: 'Once suppose that the Apostles founded the institution of the episcopate as distinguished from the presbyterate and all becomes comprehensible.' Is there any scholar of repute (even among Anglo-Catholics) who would approve such an amazing suggestion? But it is only one of many of the same nature which undermine the confidence of an inquiring reader in the competence of his guide.

The book is really a very able one, however, and it is both right and useful that the extreme view should be stated, as it is stated here, with force and good temper. The author thinks the only form of Church government incompatible with episcopacy is Congregationalism. He thinks better of Presbyterianism and has hopes of it. But his 'case for episcopacy' is a high and hard wall that will need hard and high climbing.

Patteson of Melanesia, by the Rev. Frank H. L. Paton, B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), is more than a biography of the martyr bishop. Mr. Paton writes with intimate personal knowledge of the myriad islands of the South Seas, their inhabitants, problems, tragedies, and triumphs. He has given us a brief but intensely interesting account of the whole environment in which Patteson did his life's work. And in the centre of the picture he has set that heroic and lovable figure. The narrative is both illuminating and inspiring, and is fitted to raise in every humane and Christian mind 'the challenge of the Pacific.'

When he was a child Dr. S. P. T. Prideaux was taken to a funeral, and was much impressed when the sexton threw the usual three handfuls of earth upon the coffin. Later at school he found the same rite in Horace and elsewhere, and that started his mind on a long journey, part of the fruits of which he has put into his book *Man and his Religion* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. net). He drops us all kinds of information by the way—why heel taps are left in glasses, why we eat Hot Cross Buns, why ships have a bottle broken on them at their launching, and many more on every page or so. But his real inquiry is to consider the rites and the like of our religion, why they are here, and whence they came. He takes us on a rapid pilgrimage over the world, and comes to his conclusions on religion as a whole. And then begins his answer to the question that had haunted him. Is Christianity just one of many possible religions, or is it something more and something final?

There is no hesitation in his answer of some eighty pages; nor are his facts or his findings easily challenged.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Whit-Sunday.

BY THE REVEREND ERIC PARSONS, B.A., EDINBURGH.

'The voice of one crying.'—Lk 3^d.

FANCY calling a man a Voice! We have all heard of one voice that seemed to wander quite by itself, quite without a body. I mean the 'thin, high, trembling voice' that came floating over the trees on the Treasure Island that Robert Louis Stevenson tells about, that voice which made all the pirates tremble because they thought it was dead Captain Flint singing—a voice without a body. But it was only poor Ben Gunn. There was a body to the voice.

And John the Baptist had a body. Yet he was called a Voice. Why? Because the 'whole man was a sermon.' His words were only a small part of his message. Every bit of him spoke—his shaggy dress, burning eyes, and strong wild figure—all so fierce, and yet with so gentle a touch as he baptized people in the river. Every bit of him spoke, and spoke of God. So he was called a Voice.

You think it strange to call a *man* a Voice? But it is not so very strange. After all, we haven't always spoken to one another with our voices. People used to talk with their whole bodies. Before men could speak or write they made each other understand by pantomime. Babies still do that. And you would have to do it too if you went to France and had not learnt those queer French verbs. Even when we can use our tongues quite well our hands and bodies work with our tongues—every bit of us speaking. When teacher is telling us something we ought not to do he can use words and need not shake his fist at us like the farmer who is too angry to speak because we have trespassed in his fields. But the teacher still wags his finger at us! When a little boy learns to write the spidery, twisty letters, so difficult at first, it is not just his hand that writes and twists and turns. His legs curl round the desk, his shoulders screw themselves up, and his little tongue pops in and out, twisting and curling with the hand that moves on the paper. Every bit of us speaks, telling of what our hearts and minds are set on.

Now we are not like savage men, or babies. We can talk and write. But still our best and truest message is our whole self, rather than our words. In two ways you can see what this means.

John was a voice preaching. Nowadays we listen to a preacher speaking words from a pulpit. But if that is the only way he preaches it is a poor way compared with John's. Nobody takes much notice of words by themselves. The world knows our real sermon whatever we may say. For we are all sermons, each one of us, messages shown to the world—maybe about ourselves—maybe about Jesus. What an idea that is, that we are all Voices, crying and shouting to the world, though we may never speak a word—each of us a sermon about Jesus!

Jesus was a Voice preaching. Nowadays we can read and hear of Him. But oh! to have known and seen Him, watched His ways! He knew that we would feel like that, knew that no book or sermon or words could replace Him or speak to us like His own self. So He never really went away. Of course we cannot see Him. But you know what you ask mother when you really must go to bed and must not shout downstairs, however lonely you feel? You ask her to leave the door open just a little bit, and then you'll feel she is near to you in the darkness. You'll be quite sure that she is there. Well, Jesus has done the same with the ones He loves. Easter opened the door to all His children, and Whit-Sunday kept the door open. And that comfortable feel we have when we know mother is near is like the presence of Jesus. He left us in the dark; He had to. But He left us with a Comforter. He knew that there was no message or word like the presence of Himself.

A Nasty Wicket.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT STRONG, M.A., B.LITT., LEEDS.

'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'—Ec 9th.

All of us would choose a good wicket if we could get one, so that we might be free to show our skill, without any of the unexpected difficulties that the bad wicket presents. We don't blame the captain who would rather not accept the risks when he thinks the wicket is too bad for play. But if the umpire decides that the game must go on, we admire the team that settles down to play the game for all they're worth, making the very best of the situation. We say quite rightly, 'That's cricket.'

One of the joys of youth is that we dream of life, and think of the game as one that is going to be played on a good wicket. When we are going up

for our examinations we have a secret confidence that, having done our best, the examiner will ask us just those questions we do know something about, so that we can show our real powers, and make a stand, pleasing to ourselves and everybody else. Or we dream of those later days, when we have passed from the stage of school, and expect that when we go out into the bigger world of affairs we may meet wise kindly people, find a good opening, and in business or profession play the game with some show of glory. We shall be all the wiser if we know that life doesn't always provide a good wicket for our displays, that there are all sorts of tricks of fortune which insist that we go on to play the game when many facts are dead against our chances. Examiners don't always seem specially interested in the things we have got up with so much care, and seem to be fond of those matters to which we have given only the slightest attention. In business, we may find that people are not always keen on giving us a chance, so many of them being too busy seeking chances for themselves, so that they don't mind pushing others out of the way instead of helping them. There is no sense in being afraid of these facts, but it is good sense to make up our minds what we mean to do when the wicket is a pretty bad one, as, of course, it sometimes is.

Here are three rules for playing the game on a nasty wicket.

Don't sulk. It would be easy, so easy indeed, that it really isn't worth doing, to sulk about the whole thing. Why should we have to play on a pitch like this? Why should we have such bad luck, when people not half as good as we are, seem to have no end of splendid opportunities? Well, we had better tell ourselves that this kind of talk is not cricket, and in the great game of life a sportsman is not going to spend his time in being sorry for himself. When Elijah began to talk in this rather dreary fashion, there was nothing for it but to get him out of his cave, and set him on the mount before the Lord, so that he might forget himself and see that he belonged to a team. It was rather a shock to him to realize that he was by no means alone, and that sulking was only foolishness. When the hard times come, that bit of good humour which saves a man from thinking too much about his own desires, and sends him merrily into the fray, will help him to win through, and that not without glory.

Be patient. When the wicket is tricky there is no time for taking any foolish risks. Saving the game demands a patience that will not tire. Don't let anybody imagine that the patient way is the easy

way. It takes vastly more courage and resistance to play the game after this fashion, than to do rash impulsive things. Only a perfectly disciplined hand, eye, and mind will serve a man when the task is of this order. When the hard times come in life, all the self-control we have been able to develop will find its use. If we have never learned to use the courage of patience, the nasty wicket may easily beat us. This needs to be trained all the time, so that the new situation does not startle us into failure.

Watch for chances. On the bad wicket there will come now and again the chance to do a good thing and send up the score. All the men who have ever done anything worth while in the world have done this, not because facts were always in their favour, but because they have learned to expect chances even in bad times, and have not been slow to take advantage of them. Captain Scott was set a difficult pitch, but what a game he played! This is what A. Cherry-Garrard says about him: 'He was not a very strong man physically, and was in his youth a weakly child not expected to live. He will go down to history as the Englishman who conquered the South Pole, and who died as fine a death as any man has had the honour to die. His triumphs are many—but the Pole was not by any means the greatest of them. Surely the greatest was that by which he conquered his weaker self, and became the strong leader whom we went to follow and came to love.'

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Immortality and the Comforter.

'If a man die, shall he live again?'—Job 14¹⁴.

'If it were not so, I would have told you.'—Jn 14².

Perhaps the oldest and most persistent question of the human heart is that of the immortality of the soul, the persistence of personality beyond the grave. There seems never to have been a time when mankind was not considering it. Job was not the first person to articulate the ancient query; nor was he the last.

To-day, as yesterday, the answers given to this age-old question are of three general types. In the first place, there is the denial of the doubter. In the absence of any actual knowledge as to the reality of immortality such a person insists that he cannot feel that the preponderance of probability is sufficient to justify belief in the theory. Such

a man was Thomas Huxley, for example. Even when he stood by the grave of his oldest child, Noel, overwhelmed with grief, and his great-hearted friend, Charles Kingsley, besought him to find comfort in the immortal hope, Mr. Huxley replied, 'I have searched over the ground of my belief, and if wife and child and name and fame were all to be lost to me, one after the other, as the penalty, still I would not lie.'

In the second place, there is the answer of indifference. Always there have been those who are simply not concerned with the question of immortality for the reason that they deem the whole issue quite inconsequential. Here, for example, are men who are face to face with daily duties, challenging tasks and captivating opportunities. 'Why think of what lies beyond?' they ask. 'To dream of the hereafter dampens one's ardour to work while here. There may not, indeed, be any immortality for the individual soul. Think, then, of the immortality of influence one may achieve. Work not for your own soul's sake, but for humanity's sake.'

Before passing, therefore, to the consideration of the third type of answer—that of the triumphant believer—let us ask briefly just what difference it *does* make whether we believe in immortality. To cite a single aspect of the problem as illustrative of others, it might be wise to consider the mighty difference the belief in immortality makes in the way we think of *ourselves*. What are we, really: animal or spirit, mud or mind, body or soul? If the former, then we may have our little day and cease to be—and obviously it doesn't matter much what one believes about life after death; indeed, the idea of immortality resolves itself into an absurdity. If, however, we are in reality the latter—spirit, mind, soul—then it would seem that nothing short of eternity would suffice for the development of our spiritual potentialities.

It is because of this fact that there has always been a third class—those whom I would call the triumphant believers! Their answer to the age-old question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' is a mighty affirmative. But it is the affirmative of a rational faith, not of a blind belief, nor yet of demonstrable knowledge. As Martineau remarked, 'We do not believe in immortality because we can prove it, but we try to prove it because we cannot help believing it.' In other words, the ultimate argument for life after death is the *instinct* of the human soul. 'When God wants to carry a point with His children,' says Emerson, 'He plants His arguments in the instincts.' This, it seems to us,

is what Jesus recognized when He met this great issue of immortality with that singularly simple but suggestive statement we have chosen for our second text: 'If it were not so, I would have told you.'

We *know*, really, only the lower things of life. The best things of life we *feel*. We know that two and two make four; we can prove that. But take such a thing as Love, for example—a matter of life and death, if you please. One never knows that another loves him, in the sense that it can be proven beyond peradventure of a doubt so as to convince a mind disposed to believe otherwise. Or take Honour or Integrity. We never know that it pays to be true and honest and strong and noble and pure. All these things are not of knowledge. They are convictions; they are instincts of the soul.

Let us look, then, at some of these instincts; and we shall see how utterly impossible it would be for a good and wise God to allow this human career to cease at the grave.

In the first place, every man is full of *desires*—and the broader and deeper and better the man, the more and greater his desires. Civilization, considered in its wider sense, is but the development of new desires and new ways of gratifying them. Education is but the transforming of low desires into higher, more intellectual, more spiritual desires. Then let us note this: *The better a man's desires in this life, the less probability is there of their gratification!* Nowhere in the lower order of creation are there any desires unless in the environment of the creature there is provided that which can satisfy the desire—nowhere *except in man*. And man's desires! The whole earth cannot meet them.

And what of the *elusiveness of life*? The poet says that man never is, but always to be blest. We live by hope. The realization has always some tiny tinge of disappointment in it. The boy thinks he will be happy when he gets to college, and at college all his dreams are of what he will do when he gets through. And when he accomplishes his success—nine-tenths of them don't accomplish it—but when the one does, he is looking forward still to something, and old age finds him with his back bowed and his hair silvered, still looking forward.

And then, if this life be all, look how all *discipline* is wasted. We spend forty, fifty, sixty years, learning how to live. A man just learns how to live and then he dies. Would a man carefully train his boy to be a mechanic, or an engineer, or

an orator, or a writer, or a business man, and then, just as he graduates from college, take him off and kill him? And would God Almighty train men, the best of men, by the discipline of a long life, until they are more nearly able and competent to do and to think properly, and then drop them into oblivion?

Look, too, at *the highest faculties* we have. The more remote a man's aims, the nobler his life. Is it possible that that man who cares nothing for noble purposes and high thought, grovelling in gross gratification, yet living just decently enough to keep out of the penitentiary and avoid social complications, is reaching the real goal of life, rather than those who are perpetually disciplining themselves to a nobler aim?

Then mark a deeper instinct in man, the deepest instinct of all, *the love of life*, that you can never get out of any human being. We call this the first law of Nature—life! *Eternal life*! Could the language of this instinct mean anything else? *Eternal life*—there must be! Is it not so, O Christ? And He says, as of old, 'If all the deep instincts of your being were to be blasted, I would have told you.'

And then the Bible! It is a book of promises. 'Yet the patriarchs,' says the Apostle, 'died, not having received the promise.' In our own case this Book promises us that Jesus shall save us from sin. Have any of us been saved from sin absolutely? No; we have been saved in a measure, but only in a measure. The perfect salvation does not come in this life. He has said, 'Come unto me, and I will give you rest.' Have we ever received a perfect rest? Not perfect. Perfect joy? Always some bitterness in the cup. Perfect satisfaction? We shall never be satisfied until we awake in His likeness. And so we come to the gates of death with all these fragmentary promises of our instincts in our hands.

We know the story of the ugly duckling. All the ducks in the barnyard made sport of this little awkward stranger. He couldn't walk as they did; his neck was too long and his wings were too clumsy. So all during his duckhood he had to spend his life the scorn of his companions; until one spring day, when the air was balmy and soft, and they heard above them a strange and distant sound as of birds flying and crying, this ugly duckling looked up and saw a little speck in the sky, and then a waving line, and from that line there came the call to him. He tried his wings, he spread them, and then he sprang from the ground and soared into the air, and his companions knew him no more.

He did not belong to them. And, by the way, I think they said he had *died*.¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Life's True View-Point.

'In heavenly places in Christ Jesus.'—Eph 2^o.

'I sat where they sat.'—Ezk 3¹⁵.

Paul's conception of the work of Christ is, in part at least, that it gives men a new elevation from which to consider life. Of course, there is infinitely more in this great word of his. But this it certainly declares: that when a man is laid hold of by Christ, and becomes united to Him by faith, he ascends with Him to heavenly heights, and sees life thence, not merely in its often perplexing detail, but in the grand design of an overruling God. Isaiah anticipated this very thing when he encouraged men to wait upon the Lord that they might mount up with wings as eagles. And both unite in making it abundantly plain that all such experience of elevation is but preparation for active fellowship in the affairs of the valley. The sacrament of communion with the ascended Lord equips His disciples for the sacrifice of self-interest in the service of human need. Those who mount up must in turn descend to run with zeal and courage upon errands of mercy, and to walk without fainting amid the common trials and tests of earth. What we need most of all to-day is, to combine the conception of Paul with the experience of Ezekiel—that is, to realize the fullness of our redemption in Christ; and, thus inspired, to give ourselves to the service of our fellows in His name.

The true order of faith is not that we have to live an earthly life with a view to heaven, but that we are called to a heavenly life with a view to earth. The common idea is that, by developing a certain kind of character here, men are prepared for the ultimate life of service and worship beyond. And much of the pathetic weakness of the Christian Church in these days of crying need is to be traced to this misconception. As a matter of fact the New Testament declaration is that all true life is heaven-derived. It is a gift, offered and received on the terms of faith, to be translated by obedient and loyal devotion into terms of self-sacrificing service.

This is declared and manifested in Christ Himself. It was as the Man of Heaven that He lived among men. In Him the energy of Sonship was transformed into the enterprise of Saviourhood. He

¹ H. H. Crane, in *If I had only One Sermon to preach on Immortality*, 51.

came with the life and love of God—and then sat where the captives sat, amid the lepers, the poor, the broken-hearted, the strugglers. And He sat there, not as spectator, but as partaker of their griefs and sorrows.

We are often content to regard ourselves as Christian because we hold to certain beliefs or observe conventional forms. What we need is a new emphasis to the Evangel, recalling us to the fact that according to Christ's teaching and example a man is a Christian only when he is united to Him in this twofold relationship—toward God and men.

The strongest solvent of the varied human difficulties with which Christ's servants have to deal is sympathy. By this is not meant an affected interest in the affairs of others, after the fashion of the superficial person who has an ear for every man's concerns, and a heart for none but his own. It is the product of a twofold intercourse—with God and men. It is at once derived in the sanctuary, and distilled from life's experiences. Ezekiel had never been the prophet he was, nor uttered the message he spoke, had he not sat where he did with the captives. For identification with the sins and temptations of others most surely enables us to help them in regard to the fundamental and abiding things. We may destroy men by influence exerted distantly; but they cannot be healed save by the human touch of one who sits where they sit.

To this fact the history of all great service bears witness. It was as Peter the Great of Russia sat in the squalid cottages of the moujik—coming thither from his throne—that he was able to carry out the noble changes effected in that empire. Elizabeth Fry, descending from the refinements and pieties of a lovely home to sit in the pestilential prison of Newgate, not only lifted the prisoners into something of her own Christian experience, but ultimately made certain also the reform of prison law in the direction of humanity and justice. And all great missionaries—David Brainerd, James Gilmour, William Carey, Adoniram Judson, David Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, and a host of others—have accomplished their life-work only on this wise.

The only preparation and dynamic for such contact with earth is separation unto God. Heavenly heights are not gained except as weights which hold us down are cast aside and cables which bind us to things material and earthly are cut. And it is there, and there alone, in fellowship with Christ, that the double miracle of elevated vision and elevated motive is wrought. How necessary this is, is the consciousness of all who

know by experience anything of the elusiveness of motives merely inspired by the sight of sorrow and human suffering. These may, indeed, call forth transient emotions. But nothing save the Spirit of Christ can purify the heart of its evil, and so secure us against the danger of becoming infected by the very things which destroy the lives of those we would fain help. Only by sitting with Him can we be saved from losing heart, as we catch the vision which reveals God at work through all earth's changes, and from the fitfulness which renders service worthless by the reinforcement of His own steadfastness.

Life is for us all a great mission. But we shall miss its meaning and opportunity if we fail to regard it from this double view-point.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Virgin Birth.

'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son.'—Mt 1²³ (R.V.).

The subject of the Virgin Birth is one that has caused a good deal of difficulty to sincere souls, and has given rise to considerable doubt in serious minds. To dismiss the whole subject as irrelevant to Christianity is hardly possible, because it is not only explicitly confessed in the great Creeds, but it is affirmed in the *Te Deum* and in many of our favourite hymns.

1. The literary evidence is by some held to be insufficient. It is confined to two passages in the Gospels.

The story of the Virgin Birth is found only in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and there only in the opening chapters; for in the rest of these Gospels Jesus is spoken of as if He were the son of Joseph and Mary. Might not these earlier chapters have been added later? All we can say is that there is no manuscript evidence to give any support to this suggestion. It is pointed out that the clear assertion of a Virgin Birth is confined in St. Luke to only two verses (1³⁴ and 3²³). Of the first of these there is manuscript evidence for omission; but it is found only in one manuscript, a second-rate Latin version which would carry no authority on any other peculiarity.

A more serious weight attaches to the fact that the early and important Syriac version known as the Codex Sinaiticus reads in the genealogy of St. Matthew (1¹⁶), 'Joseph begat Jesus.' This reading is supported by two or three manuscripts of the Old

¹ J. S. Holden, *The Confidence of Faith*, 66.

Latin version, and by two late Greek manuscripts. It is possible that this might represent the original text; for the genealogy as traced in St. Matthew really demands that Jesus should be reckoned as the son of Joseph; but, even if so, it would only be in line with the conventional statements in the rest of the Gospels where Jesus is spoken of as the son of Joseph. It is because of the great doctrinal importance of the passage that this peculiar testimony has deserved any consideration at all; it is only an interesting variant. Thus we are compelled to sum up the literary evidence, so far as it goes, as overwhelmingly consistent and unwavering.

But there is the complete silence of the rest of the New Testament. We need not count one way or the other the general habit of Jesus being spoken of both by the people and by Mary as if He were the son of Joseph; that would be inevitable.

But if there is no evidence elsewhere in the rest of the New Testament, there are a number of allusions which are in keeping with the fact of a Virgin Birth. St. Paul could hardly be expected to refer to it, from the nature of his Epistles and the general absence of detail about the life of Christ; but he does say, 'God sent forth his Son, born of a woman.' This is not the only Hebrew way of referring to human birth; and though it does not affirm the Virgin Birth by any means, it does not deny it, as any other expression for human birth might have done. The silence of St. Mark is natural, as he begins his story with the baptism; but what is curious is that he never mentions Joseph by name at all or refers to the father of Jesus; and in one verse, where St. Matthew and St. Luke have the question, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' and 'Is not this the son of Joseph?' respectively, he has, 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' This is something more than silence, and perhaps something more than coincidence.

2. It is alleged that the story can be explained easier than as fact. It may be due to the influence of prophecy. Our text is a quotation from Is 7¹⁴; and it is suggested that the prophecy may have given rise to the whole idea. It will be noticed that there is no quotation of this prophecy in St. Luke; and it is difficult to see how the quotation can have influenced St. Matthew thus far. For the Hebrew word need not mean 'virgin,' and Jewish commentators do not take the original meaning to be a promise of a virgin birth or regard it as a prediction concerning the Messiah. Like the rest of St. Matthew's quotations, it is so completely apart from its original meaning that it is vastly easier to comprehend how the fact could

have recalled the prophecy than the prophecy have created the story.

It is frequently alleged that the idea of a virgin birth is to be found in heathen religions; and it is therefore no marvel that it arose in Christianity. But that is just the difficulty; for even if it were a frequent incident of pagan mythology, that would hardly have recommended it to the Jewish mind, with its exclusiveness and its hatred of heathenism. Moreover, if we examine the alleged instances of virgin-birth myths, as Perseus, Romulus and Remus, or Isis, they turn out to be anything but virgin births.

Others think that the poetic impulse is sufficient to account for the story. We need not dispute that the Nativity stories are poetic in form; they are most beautifully told, and full of restraint, as a comparison with the Apocryphal Gospels sufficiently reveals. But the poetry is due not to the telling of the story, for that is very plain and matter of fact, but to the beauty of the subject. And if this story had been told merely as a poetic myth in order to show that all birth is pure and begotten of God, it was unfortunate so deliberately to exclude the male parent; for, owing to wrong interpretations of why this was necessary, it has had anything but this effect. We are driven, therefore, to conclude that no explanation but the one of fact at present holds the field.

3. The real difficulty lies in the want of a rational necessity for the Virgin Birth. This is not satisfied by saying that it was a miracle. We are not so inclined to shy at the word 'miracle' to-day. We are able to believe that while God works normally along the lines of what we call natural law, He is not bound by that when some higher necessity calls. If the Virgin Birth is a miracle, we have only to show that it was an absolutely necessary miracle. This is not shown, to our mind, by the necessity of introducing a new race; for the race of the spiritually reborn continues to be born physically in the ordinary way. Neither can there be any plea that it was necessary in order to prove the Divine origin of Jesus; miracles are not wrought in order to produce faith.

Nor can we accept the common explanation that the Virgin Birth was necessary in order that Christ should be born sinless. For this would involve admitting that the ordinary method of generation is essentially sinful.

A much more natural necessity can be suggested. The Virgin Birth was necessary for the purpose of the Incarnation. Recall what that purpose was. It was twofold: to reveal God to man; and to

reconcile man to God. For the former, it is absolutely essential that God reveal Himself *in person*; nothing less can give us an assured revelation. Therefore, if Christ is the incarnation of God, His Person must be Divine. But in order to fulfil the second necessity, that of reconciling man to God, that Divine Person must live a truly human life, within the normal limitations of a human body, mind, and soul; so that while the person is absolutely Divine, the life is a truly human achievement. Now, this involves that the person of Jesus must have been pre-existent. But the ordinary method of generation produces a new person; if, therefore, there had been the ordinary method of generation, we should have had two persons, entailing dual personality, with nothing higher to unite; for person is the highest category of being. Or the one person would have had to be destroyed, or suppressed, or absorbed by the other. This is just what Nestorianism was condemned as involving; and it is actually the doctrine favoured by modern Theosophy.

Now, if this necessity was the determining factor in the Virgin Birth, it carries with it very important conclusions. We can only suggest what these may possibly be. It shows that God regards human personality as a thing so sacred that there must be no tampering with it; even for the purpose of saving the race. When God planned to save humanity, He could not begin by destroying a human personality. The Virgin Birth, therefore, puts upon human personality the highest possible seal. It is not, let it be said clearly and emphatically, to be deduced that ordinary birth is not sacred enough; but that human personality is too sacred to be interfered with.

A good deal of the objection to the Virgin Birth has come from the critical study of the New Testament, because that has seemed to reveal that the relationship between Mary and her Son was so strained that it precludes any idea that there could have been anything remarkable about His birth. But it may be just because she knew of that, but interpreted it as involving a quite different kind of life, that on various occasions she did not always interpret His will or understand His actions. If there was a misunderstanding between mother and Son, it was one that was almost inevitable; but it was not a misunderstanding that prevented her from giving to her Son the purity of her heart and the piety of His early days. The gospel shows all misunderstandings gone by the time Christ came to die.

There is something of the revolution of all earthly

standards about the whole business, of course; but that is what it is meant to be. It means the exaltation of lowliness, poverty, and obscurity to the place of power, glory, and fame. It means that male ascendancy is over, for woman here receives the highest place; and it is therefore the guarantee that every sign of subjection is doomed eventually to disappear. It means the exaltation of the mother and the child, the sanctification of sex, and the purification of everything that affects human conception and generation. It sets the absolute seal of Divine care upon human personality.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Observance and Righteousness.

'Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'—Am 5^{23, 24}.

The prophet Amos wants to emphasize the futility of mere religious ceremony and observance without any ethical, social result. It is indeed a tragic picture, this, of a God who is positively bored by worship: who hates our feast days, implores us to leave off our choral services. Tragic, because, with many of us still, the outward sign of religious progress is the proper observance of feasts and fasts and the excellence of our ritual or church music. The Church, as a whole, has not learnt to put the outward observance in its proper place as a means to an end. Neither has it created enthusiasm for the end to which it is the means. The end is God and righteousness. The prophets neither here nor anywhere else disparage religious observance; they only plead for its proper place in spiritual economy. They use startling expressions to wake us up from our complacency. Isaiah, the son of Amoz, talks of the 'iniquity of the solemn meeting,' and chaffs the Temple trampers. Incense has become an abomination: the Lord is weary of the sabbatarians. Jeremiah is implored by God to persuade the people to leave off praying: it is unnecessary because they are quite certain to pray wrongly. Such expressions are calculated to make us very suspicious of the things in which we are most tempted to place our trust. We need to be shaken out of our childish faith in outward things.

Now, however deeply men may become immersed in formalism, whether of one kind or another, there are always the prophets who see the vision of the true God and the inner meaning of religion. Warnings against unreality in religion,

¹ W. E. Orchard, *The Theology of Jesus*, 65.

the recalling of religious men to the practical conduct required of them by their profession, accompany, or shortly follow after, all religious movements. So we find Bishop Latimer calling the attention of his contemporaries to commercial fraud and avarice, lamenting that things are as bad under the Reformation as they had been under the Pope. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were societies for the Reformation of manners and Guilds of holy life. We find the Society of Friends wearied by sermons, and even Bible texts, quite as much as irate against sacraments, and pleading for a pure life in the world and not of it as a result of the perception of the inner light of the spirit. They, the most spiritually minded of Christians, became, and still are, foremost in every kind of social reform. We find William Law suggesting a devout life not merely in the seclusion of Christian homes, but in the midst of business and society. While the thrones of Europe were tottering and labour unrest was disturbing, to the point of murder and arson, the whole country, it was men like Maurice and Kingsley who boldly declared that it was the work of the Church to establish God's Kingdom, and that socialists must be Christian and Christians socialist. While the Church, encouraged by political economy, which it did not understand, or which it manipulated for its own ungodly purposes, talked of laws of competition as the laws of God, these men dared to say it was a lie. These were prophets sent by God to England as truly as any sent to Israel in old days.

There are, then, two kinds of revival always going on in the Church, more or less, the Institutional and the Ethical. So long as they are separated they degenerate or fail. The Institutional becomes formal and remote from life: the Ethical becomes dry and uninteresting, separated from religion. What we want is a combination of the two as in the Person of Jesus Christ. He preaches a righteousness which is to exceed the righteousness of the institutionalists, yet not one jot of the law which the institutionalists love is to be allowed to fail. This they are to do and not leave the other undone. In the very act of teaching men what worship really means He inaugurates the greatest ethical revival the world has ever known. He offers the purest worship that has ever been offered to God by the living sacrifice of a will wholly given to the Father, in a life obedient unto death. The special mark of the Institution which He founds is the mutual love of one member for another. The world is to be attracted to His Church not by ceremonial, but by a surprising oneness like the

oneness in the Godhead; and His Divine mission will be recognized not by the recitation of Creeds, so much as by the spiritual unity which will be manifested. His followers will acknowledge His authority not because He comes to them with the official recommendation of a Scribe or a Pharisee, but they will be compelled to confess that no man ever spake like this Man. For any one who wants the great reality, God and eternal life, there is obviously no one else to whom to go.

The Kingdom of Love is at hand, and men can enter it if they will. The earth need not be this sorry scene of hatred and ill-will. Follow Him, accept His standard of conduct—a life that is ever turned to the Father and bent on carrying out God's will, a life that finds God in feeding the hungry, and tending the prisoners and the sick, a life of mercy and justice and self-control. And all this not merely for the production of a saint here or there, but as a principle of life which is to pervade all human society; it is to overcome the world. It is the Father's good pleasure to give us the Kingdom. The disciples, then, must be joined together in a body that they may bring about the Kingdom. The Spirit is poured out upon them, and the Church begins. They have a Way of life, faithful to their Master, brotherly to one another.

Here we have the perfection, in ideal, of the Christian Institution and the Christian ethic. Can both live again? Must it ever be that when Christians revive the body of the Church they so often kill the spirit, and when they revive what they think is the spirit they so often decry or quarrel over the body? Can we not have the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace and righteousness of life?

During the last seventy or eighty years there has been a great revival of the Institution in the Church of England. We have rebuilt our churches, our altars, and our fonts; we have improved our services almost beyond recognition; we have re-established our claim to be a true part of the ancient Church of Christ. Side by side with this revival, and often overlapping it, there have been, by the mercy of God, prophets like Maurice and Westcott ever reminding us of the call of Christ to righteousness of national life. There is nothing, perhaps, more sad than the fact that ethical revival is always so much less popular than the other.

Many practical departments of human life are ruled out as not intended to be affected one way or the other by membership in the Church. The newly-confirmed rich young ruler is seldom told

that he is to revise his life beyond seeing to his personal purity in sexual matters. He may receive his rents from slums, and sweat his employees, and generally conduct his business or profession in the same way as the worldlings do.

There is an evil spirit which mars Christianity. It has always been angry with the striker, and was never at all displeased with the profiteer until his selfishness extended its baseness to embrace the whole nation. It still looks upon the clerical reformer as a man who impudently interferes with business.

It seems harder to learn toleration in the Church than anywhere else. It is the balance of the really important things in religion which needs adjusting. Much of the time and energy, which we have hitherto bestowed on the outward, needs now to be devoted to the inward. To rescue the inwardness of religion from being stifled does not necessitate the rejection of the outward. It only requires a greater concentration on what is vital. So far from giving up our sacraments let us believe in their reality and set them working. If all the baptized really believed that they were the present possessors of the Kingdom of Heaven: if all the confirmed really believed that they were endowed with the Holy Spirit: if all the communicants really believed that they had fed upon the meat that never perishes: if every one who attended the altar went home from the Sacred Presence to give his own body and his own blood for the service of God and man: if every one who read his Bible were really desirous of being imbued with its spirit of faith in God and the mind of Christ, there would be little need for prophets to call us away from a dangerous externalism, for we should be in heaven while on earth, and we should discover that God had poured out His spirit upon all flesh.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The School of Experience.

'I have learned by experience,'—Gn 30²⁷.

The reason that preaching counts for so little in certain quarters surely arises from the fact that it seems to great multitudes to be a mere mechanical repetition of something which it is supposed to be necessary to believe, with no vivid consciousness, no real appreciation of the modern, urgent cry of human life.

Grey, grey are all the theories,
But green the golden tree of life.

¹ J. Adderley, *Comprehensive Religion*, 25.

And so men and women are more and more coming back to the old position that experience is the only real teacher. One of the greatest figures of last century, Ibsen, has said of what is perhaps his supreme creation, *Brand*, 'It came into being as the result of something which I had not observed but experienced.' A modern writer—one of the most modern of the moderns—in a very powerful book has said: 'Life is to me just one great experiment: every time one gets more and more hurt, but one at least learns from experience.' He goes on to speak of the help we get from a man who has really lived, and he cites one who has sung as all real men of genius sing—and all real preachers preach, one might say—with a thorn at his throat, 'I have learned from experience.'

To learn by experience does more for us than all the preaching in the world and all the books we have read. Francis Thompson reminds us of the fiery inner experience, the dire spiritual struggle which set the trenches on Dante's brow.

1. Now let us look at two or three of the things that experience has taught us. First of all, experience has taught us *the inadequacy of the things of sense*; 'the irremediable inadequacy,' as Baron Friedrich von Hügel has phrased it, 'of even the totality of all our present earthly conditions, though improved to the utmost—in so far as these conditions do not include, or lead up to, God and His presence—to satisfy the soul's wants.' Perhaps some of us gain an insight similar to that of Wagner's *Parsifal*, an insight gained through temptation. We come to see that the gratification of the sensual appetites can never satisfy an immortal spirit; the thirst of the soul continues and can never be satisfied in anything other than the Eternal. We are realizing this quite vividly on a great scale in the life of the nation to-day. Matthew Arnold in the memorable *Obermann Once More*, writes of pagan Rome:

On that hard Pagan world disgust
And secret loathing fell.
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell.

And we are seeing to-day a recrudescence of precisely the same things which preceded the downfall of Rome. There can be no true life in so far as these things dominate the life of the nation, and every individual who succumbs to their spell is weakening the national life. Every time we believe that in the things of sense—the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—that in these we can find true life; every

time when by our actions we place our faith in these things we are weakening that Kingdom of God which is slowly coming ; we are holding back the chariot wheels of Christ's Kingdom. There could be no more fitting prayer for us, even if it be a prayer between sobs, than this :

Pity me still, though eyes that travel hither
See only how my hands on garlands close—
Yea, if it needs make some fair blossom wither,
Or wound me with the thorns upon my rose.

2. Now, in the next place, the lesson taught us by experience is *a new insight into the meaning and glory of suffering*. In Mr. Masfield's recent play in verse entitled *Good Friday*, the only character that really matters—for the figure of our Lord does not appear—is one accounted a madman. He is blind, and at one point he utters these remarkable words : 'I have touched wisdom since they took my eyes.' Think of Milton—as his sight fails him he but learns to see God better. Think of George Matheson, the blind preacher and poet—his sight goes and then he writes the immortal lines :

O Love that wilt not let me go.

Think of John Bunyan writing his immortal allegory in prison. Think of Tennyson in sorrow for his beloved friend, Arthur Hallam, writing his imperishable 'In Memoriam.' Think of Savonarola, of Livingstone, of Father Damien—all are types of those who turned their weakness into strength and learned in the school of experience that sorrow is not the final word, but that in it there is a strange, exultant joy.

3. Or, again, we learn from our own early experience *not to be deterred in life by what seems to be a final set-back*. What we like most of all about Dr. Johnson is the fact that his life was of such a character that he has been described for all time as one who was 'an old struggler' ; one who had passed through experiences which might well have overwhelmed another soul, but still faced the future bravely and with such courage as he might. We learn from experience that victory frequently comes only through defeat. The great words of

our Lord, 'Whosoever saveth his life shall lose it,' are interpreted by our own partial experience even here. We know quite well that life is never the flawlessly beautiful thing it appears to confident youth. 'In the midst of the years make known.' It is largely the peril of middle age, when we cannot summon up fresh energy to go on and wage the old warfare and to believe that after all the beautiful early dream is true. Beauty is not simply the thing it appears to youth. The most beautiful thing is worked out from sorrow, courage, prayer, and disappointment—that is the final beauty of life.

We are not minimizing the fact that joy can enable us to live more truly ; not turning aside from what every one of us knows to be true—how a sudden, unexpected joy coming into the life irradiates everything—yet we must know that life is not all that, so that we shall not be overwhelmed, not be too greatly surprised when the darker things come.

4. We learn in the school of experience *our own weakness, our own limitation, and we learn to turn to another*. We know there is no salvation in ourselves. We know that it is only by drawing upon an inner and Divine source, upon Christ within, constantly day by day, that we can make life clean, sweet, beautiful, and helpful to others. We learn to trust not in any supposed infallible Church, but in the unfailing Christ. That surely was the secret of St. Paul, who, in one of his highest moments expressed this desire, 'That I may know him and the fellowship of his sufferings.' In life the only people some of us care to know are the successful people. That I may know Him—'despised and rejected of men ; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.' There is no experience so illuminating as that of the fellowship of Christ's sufferings. If life has been so far a great disappointment, it is because we have never yet heard the one thing that will illumine it all and make it, if not quite clear, at least not wholly unintelligible. We need something to enable us at least to surmise a hidden harmony in what seems to be appalling discord. Only one master-hand can introduce the long lost chord Divine ; it is the hand of Christ.¹

¹ W. Major Scott, in *C.W.P.*, cxvi. 199.

Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought.

BY THE REVEREND R. MARTIN POPE, M.A., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, SOUTHAMPTON.

WHEN, in his speech before the Council of Areopagus, St. Paul proclaimed that 'God . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men . . . that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him,' he expressed what may be regarded as an axiom of comparative religion. For the science of religion has but elucidated the fact that there is a universal curiosity in the human consciousness which has led men in all ages to seek for the ultimate reality. 'Canst thou by searching find out God?' was the question put by Zophar to Job, and though the emphasis may be on the personal pronoun, the search for God is assumed as a perpetual activity of the soul, and the finding of God its supreme desire.

There is a further fact which emerges in this connexion. Experience tended to invest this greatest of all quests with a halo of mystery: a mystery that, as Otto says, was not merely something to be wondered at, but something that captivated and intoxicated. It called for the exercise of the highest faculties of mind and spirit. It was not really a task for the multitude, but for the trained mind. The great secret was only attainable by the few. It was left for average humanity more or less blindly to accept their findings. Hence it would appear that the idea of an interior and exclusive knowledge of the Divine is of very ancient origin, possibly coincident with the oldest faiths of the world. Here is the germ of gnosis, the higher, deeper insight into spiritual reality professed by masters, who, having as they believed, found God, have claimed the gift of instructing others in their quest of the unseen, and have founded schools for the cultivation of the hidden gnosis. The gnosis was a knowledge of God not attainable by ordinary intellectual processes. It was a vision of truth apprehended by means of a spiritual illumination or ecstasy. The more august the conception of the numinous, the more certain was the development of the esoteric element, and the greater the vogue of magic and occultism in the rites of initiation practised by the priesthoods of gnosis. For apparently it was the rule that supernatural knowledge involved a preliminary ritual, secret and mysterious.

It is difficult to locate the original source of

Gnosticism. Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt have each been claimed by the students of gnostic origins as the home of its first exponents. But the fundamental passion for God and the corresponding attraction of esoteric knowledge are features which tend to recur in all Oriental faiths: and as the latter were modified by, and in turn reacted on, Hellenic culture and philosophy, the resulting syncretism or fusion of belief and practice gave birth to a rich, bewildering progeny of strange speculations, purificatory and expiatory rites, and mysteries in which magic and cabalistic formulæ and cryptic signs played a part. Systems of initiation like Orphism, a general term for all forms of Dionysus-worship, and specific mysteries like the Eleusinian established themselves in classical Greece; and later came those of the Egyptian Isis and Serapis, the Phrygian Cybele and Attis, the Syrian Adonis, and finally the Mithras of Persia. With the conquest of Alexander the mixing of Oriental beliefs with Greek religion had a marked effect in the tendency to identify deities such as Aphrodite and Isis and to deify great men and kings: it acknowledged the rights of the individual soul, brought into play a missionary spirit, created an impulse towards monotheism, and, above all, quickened the tendency to mysticism. For our immediate purpose it is sufficient to note that Judaism, in spite of its rigid exclusiveness, could not escape these influences: its literature, its religious thought, its outlook on humanity were all modified. The vogue of a new phase of faith—the apocalyptic—was only one of many effects of the new order. It was in the second century B.C. that the Hermetic literature of Egypt took its rise. Purporting to be the teaching of the thrice-greatest Hermes, the Greek name for the God Theuth or Thoth, it was a blend of Babylonian astrology and Greek philosophy with the old traditions of Egyptian religion, and became a rival of Judaism. It was a theosophy, but a theosophy that carried with it sacraments of baptism and rebirth. At the time of the birth of Christ, further results of this widespread fusion of belief and ritual are to be noted. On the one hand, we have a Jewish thinker like Philo making an attempt to reconcile with the O.T., and in particular with the Pentateuch, the speculations of Plato and

the Stoics. On the other, we learn on the authority of Philo and Josephus that there existed among the Jews sects which gave a place to Gentile rites and doctrines. The Essenes whom they describe in detail, with their extreme asceticism, their celibacy, their sacramental meals, their system of initiation and secret beliefs which the initiate must swear never to divulge, present all the features of a community of heterodox Jews with tendencies shaped by those Buddhistic influences which affected second-century Gnosticism, so that we may think of them as in effect a Judæo-Gnostic sect. Compare also with them the Therapeutæ of Egypt—a monastic sect of Jews whose tenets and practice also show Buddhistic influence. There is also Mandæan Gnosticism, upon which a large amount of research and critical study has recently been expended, more especially in relation to a possible influence upon the Fourth Gospel. It has been held that Mandaism took its rise in Palestine in a gnostic community based on the cult of John the Baptist. They were opposed probably both to Christians and Jews—so runs the theory—and finally driven into exile. They spread to the lands about the lower Tigris and lower Euphrates, where their descendants are found to-day. Their sacred writings, though they may contain matter of an earlier date, were compiled about the middle of the seventh century. Their only sacrament was baptism. A study of their sacred books reveals a transformation into a medley of beliefs of a Babylonian-Persian nature, in which the tenets of Parsism are conspicuous, and from which it is not easy to draw safe inferences as to the early form of the Mandæan faith. Scholars, however, have emphasized the anti-gnostic and anti-Baptist teaching of the Fourth Gospel in order to uphold the theory that there was a strong Mandæan influence in Ephesus at the end of the first century when the Gospel took its final form.

Such in brief summary are some of the phases of religious beliefs which we ought to keep in mind as we open the New Testament and begin to study in particular the writings of St. Paul. His world was that of the Eastern Mediterranean and, like the Athens of his day, obviously 'religious,' using that epithet to include the God-fearing who were honestly attracted by the theism of the Jew, a select class who regarded the knowledge of the unseen power as a secret worth having, but cultivated the mysteries of Isis and Cybele rather as stimulants of their emotions than as guides to a new morality, and the crowd who, without any sense of moral defect, had a vague interest in ritual

which could influence the Divine powers for their worldly benefit, or were moved by custom to honour a local deity or by curiosity to listen to a new teacher. Clearly St. Paul was familiar with every aspect of current religious thought and practice: in particular he was acquainted with the technical sense of gnosis; but it is significant of the new light which came to him through Christ that the basic conception of his teaching is 'faith' rather than 'knowledge.' In one sense, his use of the term is remarkable, because in the Old Testament the words indicating trust or belief suggest the quality of faithfulness or trustworthiness, as in the famous statement of Habakkuk 'the just shall live by faith,' that is, by faithfulness or constancy. On the other hand, the idea of reliance on Yahweh as Lord and God of His people underlies all Hebrew theology: it was, of course, linked with fidelity to the Law, but none the less expresses a conviction of experience, and the Jew never lost his confidence in a personal God.

In this respect Jesus was a Son of Israel: dependence upon God was the foundation of His earthly life; only by virtue of such trust can either His own disciples or the Pharisees fulfil the weightier matters of the Law; only by such faith can man live fearlessly and accomplish impossible things. It is the secret of effective prayer, of healing the body, and of moral salvation. When He required faith in Himself as a condition of discipleship or of moral cure, this did not mean that He superseded God: it was not so much faith in His person as in the power of which He was the channel. It also implied loyalty to the principles He taught and for which He was ready to die. It is true that He claimed to be Messiah; but it was not till He passed into the unseen that an intellectual conviction attached to the confession 'Jesus is Lord.' Nor can faith during His visible earthly career have acquired any element of mysticism. The latter was to find expression in that fellowship with the spiritual Christ which in the teaching of St. Paul was the very essence of the Christian life.

If the confession of Jesus as Messiah or Lord implies intellectual conviction—this is involved in the expression 'the word of faith' which is the substance of his preaching—nevertheless this aspect is subordinated to the conception of faith as a gift of God, a Divine endowment varying in degree with individuals; but whatever be its measure, the vital condition of salvation, the holy life, moral resurrection (or rebirth), and finally of mystic fellowship with Christ. Christians are 'the believers' or 'they who believe,' and to be a

Christian is to be 'in Christ.' The spiritual Christ is, so to speak, the atmosphere in which the Christian lives and moves and has his being. The believer is not identified with Christ in the sense that his personality is absorbed into Christ: it is rather 'Christ that liveth in him.'

Now it is this conception of 'faith' which may be regarded as indicating the powerful influence of Hellenistic theology upon his thought. We may say in effect that his interpretation of faith amounts to a kind of Christian gnosis, and that his use of both terms 'faith' and 'knowledge' indicates closely related aspects of the same ecstatic experience. The *mystica unio* is the result of 'vision' or 'revelation.' Thus it was attained by himself, and presumably it might be the normal experience of any believer. Was, then, the Christian experience a new 'mystery'? Are we to conclude that St. Paul's interpretation of Christianity as union with Christ is closely modelled on the type of current mystery cults?

No one can deny his acquaintance with and adoption of the mystery terms, e.g. 'initiated,' 'pneumatic,' 'psychic,' 'perfect,' 'illumination,' 'gnosis,' and others. When he speaks—it is sufficient to quote one example—of the new light, he describes its function as an illumination (*photismos*), or 'a lighting-up of the knowledge (*gnosis*) of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' On the other hand, his use of the term 'mystery' never implies a ritual act or sacrament: it is a comprehensive term for the Divine purpose once hidden, now revealed, to include the Gentile world within the covenant of grace. It looks as if he used current terms which had been popularized by common usage, although in course of time their original technical significance had been smoothed away. Other terms and conceptions, such as Soter (Saviour) with the corresponding *soteria* (salvation), Kyrios (Lord), Spirit, Son of God, Logos, are current coin and cannot with certainty be ascribed to a particular source. But one thing is clear, that St. Paul's phrases, e.g. 'to live is Christ,' 'in Christ,' 'crucified with Christ,' stand apart from the attainment of divinity which in the mystery cults was achieved by magic or initiatory rite. Reitzenstein quotes from *Poimandres*: 'this is the blessed issue for those who have attained gnosis, to be deified.' This attainment of deity is a concept no one can read into the language of the Apostle: he never suggests absorption into the Divine Being: only fellowship with a particular Saviour, and that—we may add—not limited to a given ecstatic experience, but continuous with life itself.

But, it will be argued—is it not closely allied with sacramental acts such as baptism and the Eucharist? We can only briefly indicate what appears to be the relation between 'faith' and 'sacrament' in his teaching. Both baptisms—lustral washings—and sacramental meals, the eating of a god or what represented a god are rites easily paralleled by pagan ritual; but to St. Paul baptism, though it symbolized entrance into the Christian community and the forgiveness of sins, really implied a dying and a rising with and in Christ. It is not definitely connected with a new birth—that is a later development—but as a symbolic representation of the death and rising of Christ it implies that a new life in Him has begun but is not yet full grown. It is not a 'closed' experience, but initiates a continuous spiritual growth.

The Lord's Supper also sets forth in dramatic form the death of Christ and the benefits thereby assured to the believer, reminding him that by virtue of his own death or self-surrender after the similitude of Christ he has a place in the New Covenant and a share in its promises. There is one very difficult passage, 1 Co 10¹⁴⁻²², which contrasts 'the cup of the Lord' and 'the cup of *dæmonia*,' 'the table of the Lord' and 'the table of *dæmonia*.' This seems to suggest something more than a parallel with the pagan idea that the spirit of the god adheres to the sacrificed flesh and passes into him who eats it. But St. Paul mentions the pagan practice to reprobate it. The Christian cannot share in both meals; and as Mr. A. D. Nock notes,¹ while he uses the phrase 'sharers in demons' (whatever that may mean), he has no corresponding phrase 'sharers in the Lord.'

Again, common meals in memory of a founder, or common meals to which guests are invited by a devotee to meet at the table of a god (as, for example, the god Serapis—an actually authenticated example) who becomes the real host, or the rending of the flesh of bulls or pigs by votaries of Dionysus—a sort of theophagy—to represent the eating of the god, are ritual parallels; but the Eucharist stands apart as not in the first instance involving a communion, but an actual participation in the dying of Christ. The Christian brings to this observance the faith which makes real to him his own self-surrender or inner dying to an old life. We conclude, therefore, that while Christianity has its place within the circle of religious concepts and practice that prevailed in the Hellenistic world, it stands apart and is distinctive: it is never esoteric, but universal in its appeal to the human consciousness, it pro-

¹ *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, p. 134.

claims an historical Person, not a mythical god, a living Saviour, not a dead founder of a cult, one who is not the deity of a coterie, but the Saviour of all who believe; and finally its sacraments do not *ex opere operato* or automatically make men *pneumatikoi*, nor give by a mere act of reminiscence a salvation for ever guaranteed. For St. Paul the supper of the Lord is far removed from pagan initiation, which often had little relation to morality. The sacramental grace of which the Christian is recipient has to be renewed perpetually in order to the deepening and enriching of the spiritual life. Hence the receiving of the Sacrament is secondary in importance as compared with the actual conduct of a Christian, who, according to St. Paul, can throw away the sacramental blessing by failing to live according to the Spirit or to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.

Are we, then, to exclude what we may call the rational and intellectual apprehension of Christianity from his interpretation of its truths? Does he reduce it to a mystic experience symbolized by the sacramental acts and expressed in a new ethic? When he regards gnosis as a spiritual endowment and links it with 'revelation' and speaks of 'the surpassing worth of knowing Christ and the power of his resurrection,' he indicates a religious condition which is a mystic experience rather than an intellectual process. But he is nevertheless a thinker and has a mind trained in Rabbinic method and lore. He is by no means ignorant of Stoic and other speculative ideas; and he is capable of expounding, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, a conception of the Person of Christ 'than which no better example of Christian gnosis can be given,' and this in reply to a set of doctrines of a gnostic colour, though their groundwork is Judaic. Nevertheless his dialectic touches us less profoundly than his mystic intensity and his whole-hearted passion for the new ethic of Christ. This leads him to place Love above such gifts as prophecy and gnosis (or, in a less abstract sense, *epignosis*). The latter is transitory and partial: all intellectual processes being imperfect when compared with the absolute value of love and the love of Christ 'which surpasses knowledge,' or with that inward peace 'which is above all comprehension.' It has been often noted that even the statement of a great truth, as in the *locus classicus* of Ph 2⁵⁻¹¹, is used to point an ethical duty, and this is a common feature in his letters.

On the other hand, when we turn to the Pastoral Epistles, which incorporate genuine Pauline matter while presenting a post-Pauline church develop-

ment (e.g. baptism is now 'a bath of regeneration'), we are met with an intellectualized Christianity in such expressions as 'sound doctrine,' 'rightly dividing the word of truth,' and the phrase 'the contradictions of gnosis falsely so called.' Already a party of simple faith, clinging to tradition, found itself opposed by a party of knowledge. At least, this is on the face of it a probable inference. For Christianity was essentially a missionary religion. It was no longer a Jewish sect: it had awakened to self-consciousness as the exponent of a new view of God and a new way of life, in its contact with the eager, restless, inquiring Græco-Roman world. We need not go beyond the New Testament itself to find evidence of this broadening vision. The Epistle to the Hebrews, e.g., sets forth a kind of Christian Platonism by proclaiming a faith that was the assurance of an unseen order beyond and yet adumbrated by a transitory phenomenal world—a 'better country' for which the loyal witness of Christian heroes and heroines was a preparation and a passport.

But the chief evidence of intellectual advance is seen in the body of writings called Johannine. Whatever may be our critical standpoint in the much-debated questions of authorship, date, and content, all are agreed that they represent an advance on Paulinism, and commend Christianity to the intellect as well as to the faith of a later generation, now keenly alive to, and threatened by, the speculations of heretical teachers, particularly in Asia Minor. Gnosticism had now fastened itself on Christianity, and we are at the beginnings of the fierce struggle which in the second and third century was waged between the Church and the Christian gnostics. That gnosticism was regarded as the chief foe of the truths of the Incarnation and the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ is shown by the fact that the earlier Fathers—Irenæus, Justin, Hippolytus, Clement, Tertullian, and others constitute our chief authorities for that system of theosophy which was aroused to amazing activity by the advent and rapid advance of Christianity. It became a rival system of redemption, not ethical as Christianity was, but promising deliverance from a material world regarded as the seat of evil. By means of sacraments and initiations the soul was equipped to pass through planetary systems from the grip of world-powers into the *Pleroma* or sphere of the Divine Being, where it was reunited with God. The work is accomplished by a Soter (or Christus) of supreme rank who is not to be regarded as an historical person, though Jesus as a person of supreme spiritual distinction may be

united for a given period with this Divine Redeemer. The system therefore is essentially dualistic: the gnostic Soter who is essentially an abstraction, could not be identified with the Jesus of History. Jesus, indeed, might be regarded as one of the masters of gnosis; but the redemption was effected by a mythological Redeemer, who had to undo the work of an inferior emanation or god called *Sophia*, whose son Demiourgos made the world. The fallen *Sophia* had to be released by the Soter from the prison-house of matter along with the elect 'spirituals' who had fitted themselves for the ascent to God. As the world was essentially immoral, the great aim was to be delivered from it, yet morality did not count: you could rise above matter by being a self-mortifying ascetic, or you could show your independence of matter by being an unbridled libertine. We know that there were sects like the Nicolaitans and Cainites who inverted moral values.

Now the First Epistle of St. John combats the teaching of Cerinthus, who may be regarded as the first Christian gnostic. He taught that Christ (or the Holy Spirit) descended on Jesus at baptism, revealed to him the Fatherhood of God, worked miracles through Him and finally left Him, so that the man Jesus alone suffered and died—an issue which the gnostic would ascribe to the hostility of the world-powers. Christ could not suffer and had returned (to use the expression of Irenæus) to His own *pleroma*. Advanced critics like Loisy have similarly held that the Gospel in a greater degree than St. Paul's Epistles is related to pagan gnosis and is really a Christian-gnostic document, upholding Christ as a sacramental and gnostic Saviour. Probably the view of Dr. E. F. Scott holds the field: he regards it not so much a deliberate polemic, but rather as a defence of the Christian faith, while drawing on gnostic thought as in such antitheses as 'light' and 'darkness' and revealing a certain sympathy with it. The basis is the conception of Christ as the Logos—not the Messiah of a given nation, but 'the Light that lighteth every man,' revealing God with an absoluteness and finality to which no other faith or theosophy could attain in the sense that the mind of Christ is capable of ever-new interpretation as His immanent Spirit reveals Him to succeeding generations. And yet, though clothed with a sort of metaphysical halo, His Person is invested with a real humanity far removed from the phantasmal or docetic humanity of the gnostics. The author is clearly responsive to the influences of gnostic speculation in that he appeals to the reason and intellect more markedly

than St. Paul. What place, then, does faith hold in his thought, and how is it related to knowledge?

It is remarkable that he avoids technical terms like 'faith' and 'knowledge' and only uses the corresponding verbs which, as Dean Inge has noted, really agree with the essentially dynamic character of faith and knowledge in his teaching. A man may believe 'in the name of Christ': this is the attitude of confession as a catechumen: he may believe 'on Christ' Himself, and thereby has reached the stage of personal devotion to Christ. This faith is the condition of 'eternal life.' It is a stage on the journey—not a goal. The goal is eternal life defined in the words 'to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' Hence faith and knowledge are inter-related with knowledge as the crowning achievement of the soul. Knowledge, nevertheless, is not to be regarded as the gnostic stage where moral endeavour ceases. It is still a process: it is a coming to know by a way of illumination: it is not absolute knowledge; it is 'a quality of living which is evolutionary.'¹ Now we have seen that the Pauline conception of faith did not involve the complete suppression of the reasoning faculty, though its essential justification was the ethical life after the pattern of Christ. With St. John knowledge is a greater thing than faith. For him it is not either a mystic state or an esoteric possession open to a few privileged people, the *pneumatikoi*: it is a process of illumination open to all believers whereby the soul has freedom under that spirit who guides into all truth. It implies, of course (e.g. 'if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed'), a moral liberation from the powers of evil and darkness, but it is positively a walking 'in the light,' so that the light grows from more to more for the Spirit-controlled life. The universalism of Christian thought by itself lifts the new faith far beyond the exclusiveness of gnostic and other contemporary cults.

Now, as in the case of St. Paul, we must inquire into the Johannine view of the sacraments. That the gospel is full of symbolism even when the narratives may be held to have a real historical basis is undoubted, but St. John's treatment of the sacraments is remarkable. He omits all reference to the Lord's Supper in the narrative of the Passion, though he introduces a new feature in the sacramental act of the feet-washing. The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist is omitted, and we are told that Jesus did not baptize, only His disciples.

¹ Ely, *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought*, p. 144.

John himself is not the great reformer of the Synoptics: he is a herald of One mightier than himself: 'He must increase, I must decrease.' Was this interpretation of John the Baptist, as in effect a preparatory teacher, a reply to the claims of the Mandæan gnostics that John the Baptist was an incarnation of the Supreme Being? We cannot enter into this subject; but it may well be that he had in view the subversive tenets of a contemporary Gnostic-Baptist sect. It has been argued that his silence in relation to the historical foundation of the Lord's Supper may be due to a quasi-materialistic view of the sacraments, to which the members of Asiatic churches had become prone under the influences of their surroundings. But as against this view, there is the fact that the discourses in the third and sixth chapter express a profoundly spiritual conception of the sacraments which show an advance on the Pauline view, and incidentally suggests that the author regarded the origin of the Lord's Supper as a familiar fact. In the conversation with Nicodemus he announces the conception of a new birth (already prepared for by the new birth of the Pastorals) as a vital condition of 'seeing' or spiritually appropriating the Kingdom: and as if it might be thought that there were any magical virtue in the rite of baptism *per se*, he adds the words, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.' But even more striking are the Eucharistic illusions on the sixth chapter: 'The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world'; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you'; 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' And the conclusion is: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing.' The Last Supper was as yet a future event when these words were uttered: but the discourse is clearly the production of a mind to whom the Eucharist was now a familiar rite, charged with a spiritual significance of great intensity. As they stand, the words are far removed from the material and sensuous theophagy of a pagan or mystery sacramental meal. They suggest that every Christian incorporates or assimilates in some measure the life not of a mythical god or hero, but of a Spiritual Being, conceived to be for ever living, and for ever self-imparting. They suggest this truth as involved in the actual participation in a common meal which has a sacramental significance. In other words, he gives to the Eucharist the idea of communion which St. Paul's dramatic re-enactment of the death of Jesus does

not explicitly convey. His keynote is not the death but the life of Jesus. Parallelism with current conceptions and ritual may be granted, but the approach to the sacraments is from an entirely new standpoint.

To sum up, the Johannine writings by their conception of the knowledge of God as equated with 'eternal life' and their profoundly spiritualized setting of the sacraments are an advance upon, or rather a rich complement of, St. Paul's views. St. Paul's 'faith' is a mystic experience which is in a sense almost one with his concept of gnosis: both faith and knowledge tend to merge into one another as gifts of God and as the product of inspiration: and his interpretation stands apart from all Hellenistic parallels by its emphasis on the ethical issues which alone establish the reality of the mystic fellowship with Christ. St. John, on the other hand, leaves room for the exercise of intellect and reason. The whole setting of his Christology is philosophical and has a metaphysical basis lacking in St. Paul. Faith is devotion to a Divine Christ, who is also the 'Logos of life,' as a life-giving personality: its issue is a mystic experience called 'eternal life,' a possession which is not static, but dynamic, and involves an ever-advancing development of all the faculties of the soul. While both have felt the influences of current Hellenistic religious belief and praxis, its mysteries, its gnosis, its dualism, its sacramental systems, both have transcended these influences by making a mystical union with Christ, not a mechanically secured privilege, but an inward reality open to all: and, further, by their absolute conviction that He is an historical personality 'of one substance with the Father.' The Fourth Gospel goes further by reconciling faith and reason in a full-orbed Christian experience.

The true successor of St. John is Clement of Alexandria, who saved the Church from the robust but too rigid obscurantism of Tertullian by proclaiming that faith and knowledge are not mutually opposed, agreeing with Plato in believing that faith takes its rise in wonder or admiration and leads up to knowledge, which is

'a sure and firm demonstration of the things received through faith being itself built up by the Lord's teaching on the foundation of the faith and carrying us on to unshaken conviction and scientific certainty' (Strom. vii. 10-57).

When gnosticism with its subtle speculations and specious theosophy had aroused the critical spirit of the leaders of the Church to an examination of

the first principles of their faith, then, as to-day, Fundamentalism was leagued against the point of view popularly known as Modernism. According to Tertullian ('I believe in the impossible just because it is impossible'), simple faith was sufficient to counteract the deadly intellectualism of the gnostics. Clement succeeded in keeping the door open to intellectual inquiry and the rights of reason, thereby more truly upholding—as he clearly does in his portrait of the *gnostikos*, or enlightened Christian—the spirit and teaching of both St. Paul

and St. John. But chiefly of St. John, whose doctrine of the immanent Spirit—for ever guiding and illuminating the believer—is the foundation of his thought. He teaches us to look for the seat of authority not in tradition, however venerable and august, but in the perpetual testimony of the Spirit of Truth which keeps both soul and intellect alive to the inspiration of all new light, and in the inevitable flux of dogmas, forms, and institutions is for ever drawing on what is Christ's and disclosing it to us.

The Words from the Cross.

VII. 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luke xxiii. 46).

BY THE REVEREND THOMAS YATES, D.D., BOURNEMOUTH.

THERE is no embroidery in the narratives of the Passion and the Cross in the Gospels. They are direct and even laconic, without trace of dramatization, and with no comment. When St. Luke has to tell of the worst thing ever told about human nature, and of the classic example of corporate guilt, there is only the curt, bald statement, 'There they crucified him.' Yet this same Evangelist is not able to set down with the same simple bluntness, 'He died.' Nor can any of the others, when they wrote their own accounts. There was more in it than could be told by the simplicity of 'He died.' The impression left by that tragic moment was not simply of one who could bear no more, and gave up the struggle. It was the impression of One who, with powers of will and choice still in His possession, rallied them all, and *gave Himself*. There was a conscious self-giving in the very article of death. It was not the sob of a thinned and ebbing tide the onlookers heard, but the full note of a life-choice, flooding forth in the face of death. 'He yielded up His spirit,' is St. Matthew's revealing account, and the illuminating comment upon this is the heart of the allegory of the Good Shepherd in the Fourth Gospel, 'This is why my Father loves me, because I lay down my life to take it again. No one taketh it from me, I lay it down of my own accord. I have my Father's command for this.' When the sense of His Father's presence had been the surest thing in His daily experience, His Father's command had been His one guide. When in the

darkest hour the sense of that presence was for a moment lost and gone, the command remains. In the absence of His consciousness of the Father's nearness, it is still His meat and drink to do the Father's will. The faith that stands in experience is a victory that overcometh the world, but the faith that can stand in the absence of experience overcometh more than the world. It is the victory of the spirit over the powers beyond the world. It is the overcoming of the last enemy.

The three Synoptics all tell that it was with a loud cry that Jesus made His final self-committal to God. Everything must have been in the tone and accent of that cry. The thing that He said as He thus loudly cried are words which can be uttered so diversely. They may sound like the expression of a dim hope which is half a despair. They can be imagined as the half-strangled gasp of some one confronting with dismay the last necessity, and hardly knowing what is said. They can be read as if they came from a soul nearly drowned in the cold flood, and grasping with desperate grip some broken piece, in hope that somehow and somewhere he will be floated ashore.

But there is something here of a wholly different order, and if we can catch the right accent we may be able to understand the victory. Twice did Jesus loudly cry upon the Cross. Once it was a cry of horror, and once it was a cry of joy. When He knew the abyss of desolation, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' He cried

with a loud voice. That life can reach a sense of God-forsakenness smote His soul with a great horror as He made that experience His own. It was the first loud cry of Jesus. But the second time He cried with a loud voice, it was again a cry of surprise. It was strange that a soul should know desertion, passing strange for such a soul as His; but more wonderful by far was it to pass from this in sudden transition into the profoundest realization of the Father and of His love.

This is reality for Him, for there was no play-acting when Jesus died. It is reality for us, for this is our Brother. This our Brother is the great third brother of a story He Himself once told. The other Brother is not in the story of the Prodigal Son, because it was Himself, the other Brother, who was telling the story. That other Brother took the track of the wandering prodigal to find him and bring him back. His loud cry of forsakenness is the very cry of the far country. 'My God! why hast thou forsaken me?' is the authentic voice of the far country. But the second loud cry was the cry of the Homecomer who sees the face of the Father, and knows that He may come home and rest secure in the Father's love. And not He alone; He is the way for every soul among us to move out to the same receiving Father. We are brought nigh by the blood of Jesus.

It is the magnificence of Divine grace that there waits for our receiving, and as an everlasting surprise, the nearness and availableness of the infinite mercy and goodness of God. Between the awful cry of forsakenness and the cry of discovery and rest there need be but a moment and a movement. Believest thou this? It is the everlasting reality which flooded the pure soul of Jesus in His passing. 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.' 'O death, where is thy sting?'

There is more. If my soul can take hold of this 'Into thy hands,' not in a momentary fervour, but reaching down into it, and living within it, as an abiding creed, then will I say not only, 'O death, where is thy sting?' but I will cry also, 'O world! O life! where is thy menace and thy power to harm?' With all their sinister things, all their chances and mischances, all their blows of circumstance, all their buffetings of fate, all their seductions of evil, they have lost their sting. If only my soul can get down on to this as its final faith, 'Father, into thy hands!'

We want to know what is behind this strange world which crucifies its best. We want to know what is underneath and behind the last strange mystery of death. If we can get behind both

these, can we hope to find something substantial, or anything good? Is it all just law—mechanical, rigid, remorseless? Is it fate, so that my seeming choices are a mockery, and myself a cog in a machine? Is it all chance, so that we are puppets dancing at the end of a string, and some one pulling the strings and sometimes only for mischief?

These are the big questions of philosophy, and not without their great answers from that quarter. But at the end of these answers, it is faith and religion which have to take up the tale and say the last word. The last word is God. The God revealed in Jesus Christ; the God who was loyal to Jesus in His human career, and who brought Him through death. His arm is not shortened that it cannot save. With Him is power of redemption. Do not speak of our Saviour falling back like a tired child on the arms of God. It is a beautiful picture, but it is not the real sight of Jesus on His Cross. A tired child does not cry with a loud voice. See Him rather as Greatheart, the Strong Son of God, nearly beaten and broken by life's evil and malignancy, but finding God surer and greater than everything else, and knowing in the last great moment that He can be sure of, and is secure, in Him.

What is our life? A poor thing blown about like a vapour, slipping like sand through our fingers, a flickering candle in the winds, soon out and soon over? 'Underneath are the everlasting arms,' said an ancient seer. If we can get down to this underneath, down into it as a refuge so that out of its depths our souls can cry, 'Into thy hands we commend our spirits, Father,' then we grow quiet and strong. We know then that we are not the frail creatures of a day, but sons of God. Life has lost its fear, and death its sting, and we can laugh at the sun and the shining stars, for when they are old, cold and dead, we shall be found—found in Him.

This word of Jesus on His Cross has, then, as much to do with living as with dying. Jesus did not begin to say, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' when dying. He had been saying it all His life. Through youth and manhood He had used these words as the gates of each day opened, and as they closed. Life's ending will likely be as life's habit.

To make this conscious, deliberate surrender of life to God, and to take life's way as those who are committed thus, is to make the ending secure of peace. Said the angel to the pilgrim at the river, 'It is because thou didst hear that now thou dost not fear. Thou hast forestalled the going, and so for thee the bitterness of death is passed.'

We who believe in Jesus must believe with Him in this, and make His last cry on the Cross into our living and operative credo and confession. And if the grapple of the world is tightly on us, so that we feel the moral and spiritual coil in which we are entangled to be so hopeless that if left to ourselves it will be a fate, the more we must wrestle past ourselves, and summon all our faith to this venture, until we believe mightily that God is good enough, His grace and love assured enough, His power to save adequate enough for us in life, in death, and for ever.

There is a much thumbed page in my old copy of Browning, and the book almost opens itself there. It is Browning's '*Instans Tyrannus*,' the tale of a vexed, brow-beaten creature, and of how his persecutor laid his last plan 'to extinguish the man.'

Over-head, did my thunder combine
With my underground mine :
Till I looked from my labour content
To enjoy the event.

That event was to be the doom of the soul.

When sudden . . . how think ye, the end ?
Did I say, 'without friend' ?
Say, rather, from marge to blue marge
The whole sky grew his targe
With the sun's self for visible boss,
While an Arm ran across
Which the earth heaved beneath like a breast
Where the wretch was safe prest !
Do you see ? Just my vengeance complete,
The man sprang to his feet,
Stood erect, caught at God's skirts, and prayed !
—So, I was afraid !

We hear again these sayings of Jesus from His Cross. Let us at the hearing, and in sight of that solemn Cross, like that man in Browning's story, spring to our feet, stand erect, catch at God's skirts, and pray.

Saviour of men, we reach through Thy dying cry, past Thy very Cross, and catch at the skirts of God, for life and for death. 'Into thy hands we commend our spirits.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Otto on Indian Religion.

IN recent years Professor Otto has written much on Indian mysticism and its significance for Western minds, and the mistaken notion may have gone abroad that he believed himself to have discovered a good substitute for Christianity. This booklet¹ ought to dispel the error. It is full of the sympathy which makes Otto perhaps the most discerning of all theological writers on Indian religion, but also of the Christian decision that never loses touch with history and spiritual fact.

Are there messages of salvation, in India or elsewhere, which might rightly claim to displace the gospel? Certainly the great Indian faiths do profess to impart salvation; they are to-day sending missionaries to Europe and America. The only formidable rival of Christianity, Otto holds, is not acosmistic mysticism, but the Bhakti-faith. For it speaks of fellowship with God, of salvation not by knowledge or by works but by faith alone, of the immanence of a personal and transcendent God who

emphatically is not identical with the world, of two kinds of life (the worldly and the spiritual), of evangelism, of the word of promise, of eternal election and utter grace, of a present redemption. 'The rescue of the sheerly lost, of those who have neither claim nor value, their rescue not through their own power or merit but solely by free, unconditioned, electing grace—this has been taught as much in India as by ourselves.' The theology of Ramanuja and his followers reveals the most curious and detailed parallels to the Protestant discussions on grace. We can hardly wonder that Xavier, encountering the Bhakti-faith in Japan, wrote home to say that among the Buddhists there he had found the Lutheran heresy.

It is clear that Otto has a keen eye for similarities, and we may ask ourselves (apropos, for instance, of the Fall) whether he is not finding them where they have no existence. But if we wait and see, it transpires that the contrasts are greater still, and are vital.

He points out that the Gita and the New Testament are in different worlds, as the Hebrew prophets and the New Testament are not. There is nothing in Indian thought like the idea of the Kingdom of

¹ *Indiens Gnadenreligion und das Christentum*, by Professor Rudolf Otto (Gotha: Leopold Klotz; 1930, pp. 110).

God. Even the Bhakti-religion knows nothing of a goal or *telos* of the world, just as it lacks the essential conception of God the Creator. Similarly, the idea of religious brotherhood, though present, is fortuitous and external, and the Golden Rule is never stated in its *positive* form. India's view of work regards it, not as a thing intrinsically noble, but as a means to an ascetic end. How vast, too, is the difference between Indian and Christian conceptions of what we have to be saved from! Even at its best—and the Bhakti-faith *is* its best—India knows but little of what Scripture calls 'the contrite heart,' as it knows comparatively little of conscience. Not from sin's guilt and power is deliverance offered, but from non-being into being. If we try to move from the religion of Bhakti to Christianity, we find that it cannot be done, as it were, by continuous and homogeneous advance, but only *per saltum*.

Everything, of course, goes back to the distinctiveness of Jesus Christ, for all other terms of comparison are but abstract nouns, like holiness and being; but touch with Him brings us to concrete reality. And what Dr. Otto has to say about Christ as Atoner is so deep-going that we wish it had been twice as long. There is an exceptionally interesting footnote on p. 81, where we are told that the writer's famous book *The Idea of the Holy*, which is almost as well known here as in Germany, arose out of his efforts, as a lecturer, to make an avenue of approach to the doctrine of Atonement. 'This is the problem,' he writes, 'which most sharply distinguishes Christian theology from that of the Bhakti-religion, nay, from Indian religion of every kind. For India has no "Atoner," no Golgotha, no Cross. And in all that it can see nothing but "relics of Judaism"' (p. 85). There is no *a priori* or logical way of settling this dispute; our eyes must be opened to see what we really need.

There is a passage on p. 98 which reveals Otto as a true spiritual successor to Herrmann. He is speaking of Jesus' ability, while He lived among men, to produce conviction of sin. 'Even the influence of Him who is dying on the Cross is not in quality different from what His influence had been when living. Any one who came to Him with faith and understanding experienced before he went away what came to Isaiah when his lips were touched with the live coal. What was "finished" at Calvary was the very meaning of Jesus' *life*. It was not only when Christ died that Peter felt what Isaiah felt; he felt it when he sank down before Him with the prayer, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man"; and when this prayer was *not* granted.'

Perhaps it is worth while to ask whether the

resemblances between Christianity and the Bhakti-faith, on which Dr. Otto insists in the first part of his rewarding book, *can* be so close as he suggests, if finally the two religions are severed by so deep a gulf. Surely in all the genuine features of a religion there is a single characteristic quality, and if it is absent at all, it is absent everywhere. We are therefore driven to inquire more deeply, and to ask in what degree the resemblances are verbal merely.

Do not the first lines on p. 95 bring to a head the reader's growing sense that the book, which it is almost unfair to criticise, needs a glossary of Indian words?

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

French Theology.

MUCH has been written on the religious history of Egypt before the time of the Pyramids, but a fresh and suggestive book, *Études sur les Origines de la Religion de l'Égypte* (Luzac, London; 105 pp., 10s.), has come from the pen of Dr. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Professor of Egyptology in Toronto University, with a preface by Professor A. Moret, of the French Institute. The volume, which is issued under the 'Oriental Research' Series, has been written in French owing to the fact that the author, who was a student under Gaston Maspero, received from him a large number of personal notes or jottings, which it was desirable to embody with as little change as possible. Though based to some extent on this French Egyptologist's theories, it shows a careful examination of new sources, as well as considerable personal research. The author seeks to prove that the Egyptians represented four races and four religions, viz. worshippers of Seth, worshippers of Horus from Arabia, worshippers of Osiris from Syria, and worshippers of Re from the isles of the Mediterranean. How far these views are correct need not be discussed here. Not all Egyptologists will agree with the writer when he attributes a preponderating influence on the early prehistoric civilizations to Semitic elements coming from the Wady Hammamat. On this point Professor Moret himself is less affirmative. But all will no doubt agree with the author's treatment of the Egyptian religion from the evolutionary point of view, a theory adopted not only by Maspero, but by Pietchman, Ed. Meyer, Tiele, and British scholars. The book is an aid to Biblical study, as showing that Eastern civilizations were not isolated, and did not develop separately here and there. Recent

discoveries prove that about 3000 B.C. the different civilizations of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia were but three branches from one common trunk, though where the trunk grew is still a matter of dispute.

A good deal has already been written on the Diaspora, its extent, the organization of the Jewish communities, their recognition by the State authorities, their rights of citizenship and social standing, and their religious and intellectual life. All these and other important questions are discussed afresh with competent scholarship in *Les Dispersés d'Israël*, by Professor A. Causse (Alcan, Paris; 166 pp., 1929). He points out that in the fifth century B.C. the Babylonian colony was the chief one, and in this connexion he cites the tablets unearthed in the ruins of Nippur by the University of Pennsylvania, as showing that the Jews were actively associated at that epoch in the social and commercial life of Babylon.¹ It was probable, he thinks, that this colony, like that at Elephantinē, possessed regular places of worship where sacrifices were offered to Yahweh, and in this sense he would interpret such texts as Is 66¹⁻⁴, Mal 1^{10f.}, and Ezr 8¹⁶⁻²⁰. In a suggestive chapter on the interior development of Judaism, he treats of the writings of the Diaspora, and refers specially to such questions as the symbolism of Ezekiel and the Book of Job, which latter he places outside Jewish circles. He has much to say, too, on the syncretic influences which affected Jewish theology, as evidenced especially in the Apocrypha and in the doctrines of the resurrection, the future life, the angels, Satan, and the problem of evil. Altogether, Professor Causse has succeeded in giving the reader an excellent idea of the breadth and significance of the great movement which changed the face of Israel.

The Jewish wisdom literature is dealt with by Professor Paul Humbert of Neuchâtel in *Recherches sur les Sources Égyptiennes de la Littérature sapientiale d'Israël* (Neuchâtel, Secrétariat de l'Université; 153 pp., 1929). The learned author has endeavoured to trace all such literature to Egypt. It is certain, of course, that some sections of the Book of Proverbs, especially 22¹⁷⁻²³¹¹, are borrowed directly from the 'Maxims of Amenemope,' a fact first made known by Erman, and confirmed by all Egyptologists (except Budge) and all Biblical critics. But the author goes too far when he attributes all the wisdom literature, including the Books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Tobias, and 3 Esdras, and the history of Ahiqar, to Egypt as its principal source. The Book of Job rather manifests a

Babylonian source, and even the story of Ahiqar has little relation to Egypt. The fact is that the Jewish writers, in producing their wisdom literature, have drawn largely upon that of all the surrounding nations, and one must not insist too much on direct analogies with one particular nation. The similarity of a few proverbs and maxims here and there cannot prove any direct dependence of the whole literature on Egypt. The book, however, is a mass of information, and abounds in interesting and striking comparisons.

Within recent years the Christian Churches have begun to devote more time to mission work among the Jews. The continued unbelief of this important race has been the subject of numerous monographs. It has been discussed, particularly in connexion with St. Paul's thoughts in Ro 9-11, by such scholars as Beyschlag, Gore, E. Weber, and lately by Dr. Fr. W. Maier (*Israel in der Heilgeschichte nach Röm. 9-11*). Those who wish a fuller treatment of the problem, historically, exegetically, and theologically, including the teaching of the Gospels and the Acts, will find it in *L'incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament* (J. Duculot, Gembloux, Belgium; 368 pp., 1929), by M. André Charrue, who shows a thorough mastery of the subject, an extensive scholarship, and a remarkable knowledge of contemporaneous theories. Any book must be helpful to Biblical students which deals with the important question why the Jews, whom Dr. Chalmers called 'the most illustrious people on the face of the earth,' still cling to a religion from which Christ and the New Testament are excluded.

It may not be generally known to Biblical students that Paul Sbath, the Syrian abbot of Alep, who possesses a very excellent library of Oriental manuscripts, has recently issued a catalogue of these, *Bibliothèque de Manuscrits Paul Sbath* (2 vols. of 204 and 252 pp., published by Friedrich, Cairo). In this he gives a description of 1125 manuscripts. Half of these were copied between the eleventh and sixteenth centuries, and one on parchment which goes back to the eighth century contains fragments of a Syrian 'Évangélaire.' But the chief interest of the collection to Biblical scholars lies in the fact that it contains two new and important Arabic manuscripts of the Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, compiled by Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr. Thanks to Ciasca, we have at present two Arabic manuscripts of this famous work, but the two in possession of Paul Sbath contain variations of some importance. The first (No. 1020), which consists of 277 pp. of fifteen lines each, states that it was

¹ See Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A, vols. ix., x.

originally translated from Syriac into Arabic by Abu-l-Faraj, and was transcribed in 1797 by one of the servants of the Egyptian martyr Mercurios. The text commences with the Logos, Incarnation, and Childhood of Jesus, and the catalogue cites the first three verses. The second Manuscript (No. 1029), which belongs to the sixteenth century, was transcribed by Hanun, a Grecian minister of the gospel. It is not so much a copy of Abu-l-Faraj's translation as a new work, an independent version of Tatian's Harmony. The transcriber has altered the order of Tatian, and taken the Gospel of Matthew as the basis. The manuscript presents peculiarities of such a nature that it is likely to be nearer to the original than that of Abu-l-Faraj. One may hope that Paul Spath will yet publish these two new manuscripts and other treasures in his collection.

New Testament students who are interested in the critical aspects of John the Baptist's life and work will find a comprehensive and detailed discussion in M. Goguel's *Au seuil de l'Évangile, Jean-Baptiste* (Payot, Paris; 304 pp.). The book deals principally with the historical sources from which the Evangelists have drawn their material, and on this ground the author seeks to reconstitute the various episodes in John's career, and to draw certain conclusions from the study of them. His presentation of the facts will be regarded by many as hypercritical. The whole of John's history, he holds, has been unduly subordinated by the Evangelists to that of Jesus, and his rôle reduced to that of a mere forerunner who accomplished no real work of his own. This, of course, would mean that the writers of the Gospels have, consciously or unconsciously, adapted the historical facts to their own standpoint, or allowed themselves to be imposed upon by others. This is no new theory, it is at least as old as Renan. But apart from this, the book shows outstanding scholarship and a thorough acquaintance with all the literature on the subject.

J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg.

Varia.

DR. VOLLRATH put us in his debt by his recent outstanding book 'Present-day Theology in Britain,' and his present study¹ increases our indebted-

¹ *David Friedrich Strauss und seine Rezeption in Grossbritannien*, von Professor Dr. Vollrath in 'Christentum und Wissenschaft,' 1929, pp. 148-163 (Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden; M.10).

ness. It is designed by the author as a supplement to his book. We British people are again accounted to be cautious, shy, and practical, as contrasted with the continentals, and Dr. Vollrath indicates at length why and how Strauss got a footing among us. Our appraisal and reception of him illustrate the character of British scientific research and theology. Service for life is the predominant trait. We have little or no place for the ideal of science divorced from life.

This booklet² consists of lectures, and is offered as a contribution to a Christian philosophy of history. The writer sets forth his own position by a critique of that theology (the dialectic) which takes sin as its starting-point. To look upon sin, however, as an absolute fact leads, it is argued, necessarily to a demeaning of the sovereign purpose of God in human history, the reduction of Christ to a mere restorer of a Paradise lost, and the substituting, in short, of a variety of rationalistic subtleties and mythic creations for real things. Following Althaus and Hirsch among others, the author takes his stand upon 'Grace.' He stresses throughout his discussion of such themes as revelation, sin, freedom, and the Trinity, that God as the giver is the first and fundamental recognition of all true theology. Grace is prior to sin; it assumes the possibility of sin, and as recognized and misused is that which awakens our knowledge of sin and our sense of guilt. Grace has for its arena history, where all the Divine gifts proffer themselves as tasks. Adhering closely to the cosmological Christology of St. Paul the writer rounds off his discussion of the work of God in Christ as a realization, not as a restoration, where Christ as Redeemer and Reconciler is the demonstrator and inspirer of that ideal of sanctified human life which God's predestinating will has made the aim of His creative activity. The booklet is heartily to be commended, and in these mystical and mythic loving days when such great gifts as revelation are fallen into much disrepute it is a welcome antidote.

R. S. SLEIGH.

Glasgow.

² *Die Christusfrage*, von Lic. H. W. Schmidt, vi. S. 73, 1929 (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.3).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.